

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Importance of Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech I made today before the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on the subject: Is it important to balance the budget?

As I see it, balancing the budget without resorting to legerdemain or unsound book-keeping methods is certainly in the category of our No. 1 problems.

Beginning with 1792, the first fiscal year of our Federal Government, and through 1916, Federal deficits were casual and usually paid off in succeeding years. In this 124-year period there were 43 deficit years and 81 surplus years. As late as July 1, 1914, the interest-bearing debt was less than \$1 billion.

In Andrew Jackson's administration the public debt was paid off in toto, an achievement in which President Jackson expressed great pride.

It can be said for this first 124 years in the life of our Republic we were on a pay-as-you-go basis. In that period I think it can be accurately said that we laid the foundation for our strength today as the greatest nation in all the world.

Then, in 1917, 1918, and 1919, World War I deficits aggregated \$13 billion. Heavy current taxation in those years paid much of the war cost.

The next 11 years, from 1919 to 1931, were surplus years, and the war debt was reduced.

In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt came into office, and the most outstanding plank in his platform was to reduce Federal expenditures by 25 percent and to keep the budget in balance. He accused Mr. Hoover of "throwing discretion to the winds and indulging in an orgy of waste and extravagance." Mr. Hoover spent \$4 billion in his last year, and the record shows that this spendthrift Hoover was the only President to leave office with fewer Federal employees than when he came in.

Mr. Roosevelt added more than \$200 billion to the public debt during his administrations.

I took my oath as a Senator the same day Mr. Roosevelt took his as President—March 4, 1933. The first bill I voted on was the legislation recommended by President Roosevelt to redeem his economy pledge by reducing all expenditures 15 percent—a difference of 10 percent less than his original promise, it is true—but I thought this was a substantial redemption of a campaign pledge, as such things go, and I enthusiastically supported him.

The title of the bill was "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government." Our debt was then about \$16 billion. This economy program was shortlived—about 6 months—and the spending then began to steadily and rapidly increase.

Mr. Roosevelt presented 13 budgets and in every peacetime budget he promised a balance between income and outgo for the next year, but it turned out that next year never came. He was in the red all the way, and in every year of his administration a substantial deficit was added to the public debt.

There were eight Truman budgets. Three were in the black—those for fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1951. Two resulted from war contract cancellations following the end of World War II and the third resulted from increased taxes for the Korean war before the war bills started coming due. Five Truman budgets were in the red.

Mr. Eisenhower has presented two budgets—both in the red but on a declining ratio. The Eisenhower deficit estimates for fiscal years 1955 and 1956 aggregate \$7 billion as compared to the last Truman budget which alone contemplated a \$9 billion deficit.

The cold facts are that for 21 years out of the last 24 years we have spent more than we have collected. In these 24 years we have balanced the budget in only 3; and these were more by accident than by design.

We must recognize that we have abandoned the sound fiscal policies strictly adhered to by all political parties and all Presidents for considerably more than a century of our existence. It is true that during these 21 deficit years we were engaged in World War II for 4 years and in the Korean war for 2 years. Yet, in the years when the pay-as-you-go system prevailed we also had quite a few wars.

It is the quarter of a century of deficit spending which now makes balancing the budget so imperative. Young men and women, born in 1930, have lived in the red virtually all their lives. Our acceptance of deficit spending for so long a period has weakened public resistance to the evils of this practice. Bad habits are hard to change.

Will the deficits become permanent and continue to pile debt upon debt until real disaster comes? If we cannot balance the budget in this day of our greatest dollar income, when taxes are near their peak, and when we are at peace, I ask, when can we?

It is disturbing these days to hear some economists argue the budget should not be balanced and that we should not begin to pay on the debt because, they allege, it will adversely affect business conditions. Have we yielded so far to the blandishments of Federal subsidies and Government support that we have forgotten our Nation is great because of individual effort as contrasted to state paternalism?

Today the direct debt of the Federal Government is \$280 billion. Our debt is equivalent to the assessed value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value in the United States.

I think no one can deny we are mortgaged to the hilt. If we add to this Federal debt the debts of the States and localities, we have an amount in excess of \$300 billion in direct public obligations.

This is 5 times as much as the total public debts in 1939. While public debt has increased fivefold since 1939 the gross national product—the output of our factories, farms, etc.—increased less than fourfold. When debt increases at a pace faster than the increase in the value of all goods and services, the currency is diluted with consequent shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar.

But the direct debts I have mentioned are not all of our obligations. In addition, we have contingent liabilities totaling \$250 billion which the Federal Government has guar-

anteed, insured, and otherwise assumed on a contingent basis. No one can predict to what extent this contingent liability will result in losses which must be paid by the Federal Government.

For example, \$40 billion of this contingent liability is in some 40 Federal housing programs, and from recent disclosures of graft and windfall profits in the various public-housing programs, it is evident that a substantial percentage of these contingent liabilities eventually may become a draft on the Treasury.

In addition to the \$280 billion in direct Federal debt, and the \$250 billion in contingent liabilities, we have on our hands a social-security system guaranteed by the Federal Government involving many millions of our citizens, which is no longer actually sound.

The ultimate cost of this system to the Treasury is still unestimated, but the fact remains that when the income from premiums imposed upon those who are covered in the system is no longer sufficient or available to pay the benefits, then regular tax revenue collected from those in and out of the system will be used to finance the deficiency.

EVILS OF DEFICIT SPENDING

Here are some of the evils of deficit spending:

The debt today is the debt incurred by this generation, but tomorrow it will be debt on our children and grandchildren, and it will be for them to pay, both the interest and the principal.

It is possible and in fact probable that before this astronomical debt is paid off, if it ever is, the interest charge will exceed the principal.

Protracted deficit spending means cheapening the dollar. Secretary Humphrey testified before the Finance Committee that the greatest single factor in cheapening the American dollar has been deficit spending.

Since I have been in the Senate, interest alone on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than \$75 billion. At present rates, on the Federal debt at its present level, interest on it in the next 20 years will cost taxpayers upwards of \$150 billion.

Since 1940 the Federal Government has borrowed and spent a quarter of a trillion dollars more than we have collected in taxes.

Year by year, nearly in direct ratio to deficit spending, the purchasing value of the dollar has declined. Beginning with a 100-cent dollar in 1940, the value of the dollar had declined to 52 cents in 1954.

As proof of the fact that deficit spending is directly responsible for cheapening the dollar, let me mention that in 1942, when we spent \$19 billion in excess of revenue, the dollar in that 1 year declined 10 cents in value.

In 1943, another big deficit year, the dollar lost 5 cents more in value, and another 9 cents in 1946. From 1940 through 1952, an era of heavy deficit spending the dollar lost 48 cents in value, or nearly 4 cents each year, and it is still slipping but in much lesser degree.

Some may regard these facts and figures lightly, but the loss of half the purchasing power of its money in 13 years should be a serious warning to any nation.

Cheapened money is inflation. Inflation is a dangerous game. It robs creditors, it steals pensions, wages, and fixed income. Once started, it is exceedingly difficult to control. This inflation has been partially checked but the value of the dollar dropped slightly again in the past year. It would not take

much to start up this dangerous inflation again.

Public debt is not like private debt. If private debt is not paid off, it can be ended by liquidation, but if public debt is not paid off with taxes, liquidation takes the form of disastrous inflation or national repudiation. Either is destructive of our form of government.

Today the interest on the Federal debt takes more than 10 percent of our total Federal tax revenue. Without the tremendous cost of this debt our annual tax bill could be reduced 10 percent across the board.

The interest charge would be greater if much of the debt was not short-termed with lower interest rates. Should this debt be long-termed at the 3¼ percent paid on recent 30-year bonds, the interest would be nearly 15 percent of the Federal income. No business enterprise could survive such heavy interest out of its gross income.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES

Since 1934 Federal grants to States have expanded enormously in both cost and functions. They slip in like mice and soon grow to the size of elephants. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the control and authority of the States.

Nothing is more true than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs exactly the manner in which the funds are expended, even though the States partially contribute to the project. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy with grants compel the States to do things they did not want to do.

Growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was \$126 million covering 18 programs. Now Federal grants total \$3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost.

These are the figures to date. As to additional grants for the future, President Eisenhower, in his address on the state of the Union, proposed to open up three Pandora's boxes of new Federal "handouts" to the States.

The proposals by the President, if adopted by Congress, would be the greatest increase in grants to States yet undertaken and the longest step yet to Federal paternalism.

Under the administration's road proposal a "dummy" corporation, without assets and without income, would issue bonds for \$21 billion, and Washington would take control of 40,000 miles of the best roads in the 48 States.

By legerdemain this \$21 billion in Federal agency bonds would be declared as not Federal debt and would be excluded from the debt limitation fixed by Congress.

The interest would be \$11.5 billion, or 55 percent of the funds borrowed.

It was proposed to pay the principal of these bonds and the interest on them with permanent indefinite appropriations, which would remove the corporation from annual appropriation control by Congress.

The proposal would abolish the policy established in 1916—39 years ago—requiring States to match Federal funds for roads.

The scheme was predicated upon pledging federally imposed gasoline taxes over a period of 30 years for the repayment of the bonds and the interest.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, recently appointed by President Eisenhower, said of this proposal:

"We (the General Accounting Office) feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable, because . . . the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States. . . . It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financial arrangements which

might have the effect of obscuring financial facts of the Government's debt position."

Comptroller General Campbell also questioned the legality of the proposal.

We all want good roads. The people are willing to pay for good roads, but it is certainly not necessary practically to destroy the fiscal bookkeeping of our country in order to finance our road system.

These bonds would, of course, be a general obligation of the Government. There is no banker in this audience who would buy bonds of such a dummy Federal corporation without the guaranty of the Federal Government.

Should the gasoline tax be dedicated 30 years in advance for the payment of bonds issued to build roads, then, by the same line of reasoning, other taxes could be dedicated for other specific purposes. If this were carried far enough there would be no funds for the more unglamorous but essential functions.

The second of the three administration State-aid proposals involved about \$8 billion in direct appropriations and contingent liabilities for payments, grants, loans, and guaranties to States for school construction. The last bastion of States rights and individual liberty lies in the education of our children.

Federal appropriations to public schools followed by the inevitable Federal control will strike a fatal blow at the grassroots of our democracy.

I do not believe that there is a State or locality in the Union that cannot provide for the cost of its public school system if there is the will to do so.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of the President's third proposal. It was for a so-called Federal health payment program. It would be certain to cost millions of dollars annually and it could easily be the beginning of socialized medicine.

NO SUCH THING AS A FEDERAL GRANT

It is well for everyone to understand that there is no such thing as a Federal grant. All of the money comes from citizens in the States. The money goes to Washington and there it is subject to deductions for Federal administration. This money then goes back to the States less deductions, and the Federal Government tells us how to spend our own money.

Proposals have been advocated changing our budgetary system. The Secretary of the Treasury has not approved these proposals and I am certain he will not. But there are two budgetary proposals which recur with persistency, and I want to warn you of them.

First, there is the proposal for a cash budget. Those who advocate the cash budget are suggesting that the Government pay its routine bills with savings of the citizens who have entrusted protection of their old age and unemployment to the guardianship of the Federal Government. These trust funds were established from premiums paid by participants in social security, unemployment insurance, bank deposit insurance programs, etc. Not a cent of these funds belongs to the Government.

Second, some are advocating a capital budget which means that so-called capital expenditures should not be considered as current expenditures in the budget.

Those who advocate the so-called capital budget must start out with the fallacious assumption that the Government is in business to make a profit on its citizens. To my knowledge the Federal Government has never made a bona fide profit on any Government operation.

They must assume that debt contracted by a Federal agency is not a debt of the Federal Government and a burden on all of the taxpayers.

I am an old-fashioned person who believes that a debt is a debt just as much in the atomic age as it was in the horse and buggy days.

A capital budget must assume that Government manufacturing plants, such as atomic energy installations, are in commercial production for a profit, and that Government stockpiles are longtime investments for profit instead of precautions against emergencies when they would be completely expendable with no financial return.

Likewise, it must assume that the agriculture surplus program is primarily a long range investment deal instead of a prop for annual farm income to be used when needed on a year-by-year basis.

While the vastness and complexity of the Federal Government of the United States necessarily makes budgeting difficult, the so-called conventional budget currently in use offers the best approach to orderly financing with fullest disclosure.

What is needed for a better fiscal system is fuller disclosure of Federal expenditures and responsibility for them—not less, as inevitably would be the case with so-called cash and capital budgets.

With full disclosure of the Federal expenditure situation, the American people then would have an opportunity to decide whether they wanted to recapture control and bring the rate of spending into balance with the rate of taxing and thus reduce the tremendous Federal debt burden we are now bearing.

To recapture control we must first reduce unexpended balances in appropriations already made and rescind those which are nonessential. When we started this fiscal year unexpended balances in appropriations already made totaled about \$100 billion, including \$78 billion in appropriations enacted in prior years and \$20 billion in authority to spend directly out of the public debt.

The situation is made even worse by the procedure under which Congress acts on appropriation bills. Not only has Congress lost control over the annual rate of expenditure, but once the President's budget is submitted in January, Congress never again sees it as a whole until after the appropriations are enacted. The first thing Congress does is to split the appropriation requests of the President into a dozen or more bills. Then it proceeds to consider them separately over a period of 6 months or more. In the consideration of these bills attention is given only to appropriations, and these may be spent over a period of years. An appropriation enacted in a year when revenue is high may actually be spent in a year when revenue is low. There is never an opportunity in Congress, in action on appropriation bills, to consider them in terms of annual expenditures in view of estimated revenue.

To correct such an intolerable situation, along with 48 other Senators, I have introduced legislation providing for a single appropriation bill which would set forth not only requested appropriations for the future but also unexpended balances available in prior appropriations. This resolution has three times passed the Senate but has not yet been acted on by the House.

It provides further that Congress write into the consolidated appropriation bill limitations on expenditures in the ensuing year from each appropriation. And beyond this it provides that in determining the expenditure limitations all proper consideration should be given the anticipated revenue, the cash position of the Treasury and the level of our Federal debt.

By this process, the Congress and the public would have the means of knowing our fiscal position and the facilities would be provided for balancing the budget with reduction in taxes and debt.

Along with this, I have introduced legislation giving the President the authority to veto items within appropriation bills, thus according him a double check on log-rolling which most of the governors in this country have used for years without abuse.

In short, I advocate one budget with full disclosure as to our expenditures, which

fixes responsibility not only for the expenditures but also the administration of expenditure programs; I advocate a single appropriation bill in which Congress not only authorizes expenditures but controls them in a manner that can be considered in view of revenue. A budget is not a budget unless it has two sides, expenditure and income. And finally, I advocate an item veto for the President, who is elected to his office by all of the people.

With these provisions, I believe the budget can be balanced, the debt can be reduced and taxes can be lowered.

If, by budgetary and legislative procedure, we could recapture control of expenditures from the bureaucratic agencies, there are obvious places where they could be substantially reduced and eliminated without impairment of any essential function.

President Eisenhower has made a good start. The Truman budget for fiscal year 1953 totaled \$74.3 billion. Estimates of the Eisenhower budget currently under consideration total \$62.4 billion—a reduction of nearly \$12 billion. Our tax income is \$60 billion. Our deficits are decreasing, but we are not yet on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Most of the reduction has been in the military, and this is largely incident to the end of the Korean war.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, for whom I have great admiration, and the able Budget Director, Mr. Hughes, are working diligently and making substantial progress toward sounder budgetary procedure and the elimination of waste in expenditures.

We are still practically at the peak of expenditures for domestic-civilian programs and proposals for more are coming forth in a steady stream.

In fact, expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian programs now total \$24 billion, and this is more than 3 times the total cost of these programs in 1940, when we started the World War II buildup.

Even this is not the whole story on domestic-civilian expenditures, because these figures do not reflect the liabilities of the tremendous loan insurance and guarantee programs.

Nonessentials in these programs must be eliminated and this clearly can be done, as Mr. Hoover and his two fine Commissions on Government Organization have demonstrated in nearly 500 recommendations to date—some of which have been adopted, while others still await action.

With the pressure for more and more Government which seems to characterize our times, I am convinced that such constant examination of Government as the Hoover Commission surveys has become a continuing necessity.

With budgetary disclosures and congressional control, under current circumstances and conditions, we should reject all new proposals for Federal spending innovations.

In fact, the budget for fiscal year 1956, beginning next July 1, could be reduced \$5 billion by eliminating expenditures contemplated under new legislation and by eliminating increases in items under existing legislation. I would oppose all new proposals to invade the responsibilities of States, localities, and individuals and start immediately to liquidate many of the programs already in existence.

Beyond this, I would eliminate as rapidly as possible all foreign economic aid, and I would get military expenditures quickly in hand through control of unexpended balances.

So far we have spent nearly \$40 billion for foreign economic assistance. And at this late date, after 10 years of post-war foreign aid, the President has proposed to increase foreign-aid expenditures in the coming year by nearly 10 percent, and he has asked Congress for new foreign-aid appropriations in

amounts nearly 25 percent higher than were enacted during the past year.

We are still employing 562,158 civilians overseas. These people are employed all over the world, including 64 in Cambodia.

This foreign aid has got to stop sometime, and so far as I am concerned the time to stop so-called economic aid is past due.

No one favors a reduction of our present burdensome taxes more than I do. I sit on both sides of the table. As an individual, I pay substantial taxes on my business operations. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I have the opportunity to hear testimony of those who protest exorbitant taxation.

But as anxious as I am as an individual for tax reduction, I am opposed patriotically to tax reduction which requires us to borrow and add to the public debt. It seems to me to be a certain road to financial suicide to continue to reduce taxes and then to borrow the money to make good this loss in revenue.

As things are now shaping up, there will be keen competition between the two political parties for tax reduction in the political year of 1956. If we reduce expenditures this is all well and good but, under political pressure, we should not yield to reducing taxes and still further unbalance the budget. Tax reduction should never be made a political football.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I opposed the \$20-tax reduction to each individual as passed by the House of Representatives this year. This would have occasioned a loss of \$2.3 billion to the Treasury, all of which would be added to the debt. It would have given a tax relief of only about 7 cents a day to each taxpayer and would have removed 5 million taxpayers completely from the tax rolls.

To borrow money to reduce taxes is not, in fact, a tax reduction. It is merely a postponement of the collection of taxes as, sooner or later, the taxes thus reduced will have to be paid with interest. There is only one sound way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce spending first.

At home we can get along without Federal usurpation of individual, local, and State responsibilities, and we can get along without Federal competition in business whether it be hotels, furs, rum, clothing, fertilizer, or other things.

The Bible says if thine eye offend thee pluck it out. I say if the Federal Government should not engage in such activities, we should first stop new invasions and then gradually, if not abruptly, eliminate the old intrusions. When we do these things we shall balance the budget, for lower taxes and reduced debt. There will be no further need for trick budgets and debt-ceiling evasions and hiding taxes. The Government will be honest in itself, and honest with the people.

A balanced budget could be in sight if (a) we do not increase spending, and (b) we do not reduce taxes. Assuming no further cut in taxes, only a 4-percent reduction in spending, in terms of the President's budget, would bring us to that highly desirable goal.

High Level Garrison Reservoir Gains Widespread Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the widespread sup-

port for a 1,850-foot operating level for Garrison Dam Reservoir in North Dakota.

The dam is built, the project is more than 80 percent complete. But because of the opposition of a few people in a limited area the final stages are being held up. These people feel that their fears and their personal wishes are superior to the authority that Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Engineers when the dam was designed and built.

This objection has not been important until now when the reservoir is filling; when the first power will come off the generators. The upstream land must be acquired; the protective works must be built. Orderly progress calls for this work in fiscal 1956.

Congress has been asked by the majority of the people of the State not to further restrict this construction. The rural electric cooperatives—all of them in the State, have sent resolutions protesting this curtailment of hydropower; the Upper Midwest Power Forum, with 400 co-ops represented are against any curtailment of the reservoir capacity. The president of the Mississippi Valley Association, Wilbur Jones, of Omaha, says:

Congressional approval of this restriction would be a clear-cut example of the welfare of millions being sacrificed to the desires of a few.

The county commissioners of all counties east of the Missouri River by resolution are in favor of the full operating capacity of the dam. Likewise 43 cities in the State; the State legislature; the Farmers Union; 43 civic organizations and groups have publicly declared their support of the high operating level.

Other States along the river have an interest in the increased hydropower, the flood control, and irrigation benefits that a high pool level will mean.

Following are the organizations; counties, and city governmental groups that have sent resolutions to me:

REA CO-OP RESOLUTIONS FAVORING 1,850-FOOT LEVEL ON GARRISON POOL

1. North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Bismarck, N. Dak.
2. Capital Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc., Minot (representing eight co-ops).
4. Kem Electric Cooperative, Inc., Linton.
5. Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Grand Forks.
6. Slope Electric Cooperative, Inc., New England.
7. South Dakota Rural Electric Association, Leola, S. Dak.
8. Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks (representing 10 co-ops).

LIST OF CIVIC AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING 1,850-FOOT LEVEL FOR GARRISON DAM

1. Anamoose Civic Club, Anamoose.
2. Bismarck Chamber of Commerce, Bismarck.
3. Cando Commercial Club, Cando.
4. Carrington Kiwanis Club, Carrington.
5. Cooperstown Commercial Club, Cooperstown.
6. Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce, Devils Lake.
7. Drake Commercial Club, Drake.
8. Drake Volunteer Fire Dept., Drake.
9. Esmond Commercial Club, Esmond.

10. VFW Post, No. 4251—Benson Co., Esmond.
11. Fargo Chamber of Commerce, Fargo.
12. Greater North Dakota Association, Fargo.
13. Fessenden Civic & Commerce Association, Fessenden.
14. South Cottonwood Farmers Union Local No. 48, Fessenden (53 members).
15. Wells County Livestock Association, Fessenden.
16. Grafton Chamber of Commerce, Grafton.
17. Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce, Grand Forks.
18. Minnesota Dairy Company, Grand Forks.
19. Civic & Commerce Association, Harvey.
20. Harvey Co-op Creamery Association, Harvey.
21. Harvey Kiwanis Club, Harvey.
22. Harvey Volunteer Fire Dept., Harvey.
23. Hillsboro Civic & Commerce Association, Hillsboro.
24. Jamestown Chamber of Commerce, Jamestown.
25. Leeds Civic Club, Leeds.
26. McVillage Commercial Club, McVillage.
27. Wells County Farmers Union, Maddock.
28. Mayville Civic Club, Mayville.
29. Minnewaukan Commercial Club, Minnewaukan.
30. Minot Chamber of Commerce, Minot.
31. Central Irrigation Development Committee, New Rockford.
32. New Rockford Civic Association, New Rockford.
33. Northwood Commercial Club, Northwood.
34. Sheyenne Commercial Club, Sheyenne.
35. Turtle Lake Commercial Club, Turtle Lake.
36. Upham Commercial Club, Upham.
37. Valley City Chamber of Commerce, Valley City.
38. Velva Sportsmen's Club, Velva.
39. Sheyenne Valley Rod and Gun Club, Warwick.
40. North Dakota Farm Bureau, Fargo.
41. James River Valley Development Association, Huron, S. Dak.
42. North Dakota State Legislature, Bismarck.
43. North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, State Capitol Building, Bismarck.

LIST OF NORTH DAKOTA COUNTIES WHO HAVE SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS FAVORING 1,850-FOOT POOL LEVEL

1. Adams (population 4,910).
2. Barnes (population 16,884).
3. Benson (population 10,675).
4. Bottineau (population 12,140).
5. Burleigh (population 25,673).
6. Cass (population 58,877).
7. Dickey (population 9,121).
8. Eddy (population 5,372).
9. Emmons (population 9,715).
10. Grand Forks (population 39,443).
11. LaMoure (population 9,498).
12. Mountrall (population 9,418).
13. Nelson.
14. Pierce (population 8,326).
15. Ramsey (population 14,373).
16. Ransom (population 14,373).
17. Renville (population 5,405).
18. Richland (population 19,865).
19. Sargent (population 7,616).
20. Sheridan.
21. Slope (population 2,315).
22. Stutsman.
23. Steele (population 5,145).
24. Traill (population 11,359).
25. Towner (population 6,360).
26. Ward (population 34,782).
27. Wells (population 10,417).

CITIES SUPPORTING THE 1,850-FOOT LEVEL OF THE GARRISON DAM, N. DAK.

1. Anamoose, N. Dak.
2. Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Bottineau, N. Dak.
4. Carrington, N. Dak.
5. Casselton, N. Dak.
6. Cavalier, N. Dak.
7. Cooperstown, N. Dak.
8. Devils Lake, N. Dak.
9. Drake, N. Dak.
10. Drayton, N. Dak.
11. Edgeley, N. Dak.
12. Esmond, N. Dak.
13. Fargo, N. Dak.
14. Grand Forks, N. Dak.
15. Harvey, N. Dak.
16. Hazen, N. Dak.
17. Hillsboro, N. Dak.
18. Jamestown, N. Dak.
19. Kramer, N. Dak.
20. Lakota, N. Dak.
21. LaMoure, N. Dak.
22. Larimore, N. Dak.
23. Lidgerwood, N. Dak.
24. Lisbon, N. Dak.
25. McClusky, N. Dak.
26. Maddock, N. Dak.
27. Mandan, N. Dak.
28. Mayville, N. Dak.
29. Minnewaukan, N. Dak.
30. Minot, N. Dak.
31. New Rockford, N. Dak.
32. Northwood, N. Dak.
33. Oakes, N. Dak.
34. Park River, N. Dak.
35. Pembina, N. Dak.
36. Richardton, N. Dak.
37. Rugby, N. Dak.
38. Streeter, N. Dak.
39. Towner, N. Dak.
40. Turtle Lake, N. Dak.
41. Underwood, N. Dak.
42. Valley City, N. Dak.
43. Wahpeton, N. Dak.

H. R. 12

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in reaching my decision to support H. R. 12, I have given serious consideration to all aspects of the farm problem. I do not claim that the passage of this legislation will result in solving the difficult problem of overproduction of food, nor that it will result in higher prices for farm products. My criticism of the present policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson are based upon information compiled by his own Department of Agriculture as they affect our farm families today in the State of Delaware.

It appears that the Republican administration is leading the Delaware farmer down the road to lower income even faster than the farmers of the country as a whole.

For 20 years we heard from the Republican Party stories of how the Democrats were destroying the economy of the country and how they were particularly bringing "socialistic" ruin to the farmers. Yet under the years of Democratic administration cash income of the American farmer rose to heights

that never before had been reached. There was a real increase in the farmer's purchasing power that made him a prosperous consumer for the production of our factories.

I am severely disturbed by the latest figures on the cash income of farmers in the State of Delaware released by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It seems to me that farm income is dropping in my State and in the Nation as a whole at a rate that gives genuine cause for alarm.

Secretary Benson reports that in the first 2 months of 1955 cash income of Delaware farmers had further declined \$2,226,000—a quarter of a million dollars a week. If this disastrous decline in Delaware farm income is not halted, it will mean a cash loss of a million dollars a month, or \$12 million for the calendar year ending January 1, 1956.

Figures recently released by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1954 Delaware farm income fell from \$103,411,000 in 1953 to \$93,708,000—a loss of \$9,703,000. These figures indicate that a continuation of the present policies of the Republican Administration will cost Delaware farmers \$21 million by January 1, 1956, representing the last two calendar years.

Secretary Benson's farm income report shows that farm income as a whole throughout our Nation was \$4,452,000,000 the first 2 months of this year, a drop of \$251 million from the same 2-month period of last year. That is a quarter of a billion dollars out of the pockets of America's farmers in just 2 months. There has been no corresponding reduction in their costs of operation in this period. The Department itself admits that most of this drop has had to come out of the farmers' earnings.

But in 1953 when the so-called friends of the farmers were in power, the "friends" who had been telling them how bad the alleged policies of the Democratic Party were, the farmers' income immediately began to decline. It dropped to \$31,413,000,000. Last year's farm receipts were down to \$29,954,000,000. This year, according to the early indications, the drop will be even further.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture this week issued a report called *The Agricultural Outlook Digest*.

I quote from this report:

With prices a little lower, and marketings nearly as large, cash receipts from farm marketings are expected to be lower in 1954. The net income realized by farm operators will be down in 1955, perhaps by as much as 5 percent.

Why should this be if the economy is prosperous, if income in the country as a whole will be about the level of last year? Why should the farmer's income be cut still further than it already has?

Secretary Benson's Department supplies the answer. I quote from the *Outlook Digest*:

Consumer income after taxes so far this year has been running about 3 percent above the same period of 1954. About one-fourth continues to be spent for food. But a little less of the consumer's food dollar is going to

the farmer—42 cents in the first quarter compared with 45 cents a year earlier.

And, they might have added, compared with a high of 56 cents that was reached under Democratic administration.

So there is your answer as to why the farmer is going to take another 5 percent cut in his income this year—under the most optimistic circumstances—and as to why the farmers in Delaware may take a cut much deeper than that. The farmer is getting only 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. The middleman is getting 58 cents. A year ago it was a 45-55 split. The farmer gets only 42 cents for all the work of planting the crop, raising it, harvesting it, and hauling it to market. The middleman, who takes his crops at that point and puts them on the consumer's table, gets 58 cents out of the dollar.

To make these statistics specific let me cite just one more recent report by Secretary Benson. In his annual report on the production of chickens and eggs, he informs us that Delaware broilermen raised 69,620,000 birds last year, an increase of more than 1 million over the previous year. Weight of these birds was 216 million pounds, a gain of 4 million pounds. But the income received from sale of these birds was \$48,816,000 compared with \$55,803,000 in 1953.

One million more birds, 4 million more pounds of succulent Delaware broiler meat, and \$7 million less income. Most of that drop had to come out of Delaware broilermen's net income. Their costs of production were down a little, but not that much.

So there is the picture in Delaware as in the country as a whole, farm income dropping further every month from an already discouraging level that has been reached under the Republican administration. Farmers will have at least 5 percent less income this year than last. Other people's incomes will be up 3 percent, if we may believe the administration's forecast. The farmer's share is a little less than it was, just 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. We see no signs of distress on the part of Secretary Benson or his associates about this situation. They raise no cry of alarm.

A bulletin compiled by the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, dated March 26, 1955, states that—

Farm prices have declined 7 percent from 1949 to 1954, and in this same period retail food prices have increased 13 percent.

This unprecedented change in producer-consumer prices has taken place under what was promised as an administration pledge to 100 percent parity for the farmers and more food at cheaper prices for the housewife. What a farce these promises have turned out to be. An expensive lesson for the farmers and housewives but perhaps it will be one well learned.

The present policies of the Republican administration with respect to farm prices must be changed by act of Congress. I shall vote for a return to the policies which under 20 years of Democratic administration brought the greatest era of prosperity to not only the

American farmer, but to all segments of our economy—farmer, industrialist, businessman and laborer—thus resulting in the greatest consumer buying power the world has ever known. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote for 90 percent of parity and in so doing exercise my responsibility to safeguard the economic well-being of my constituents.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 164th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, and on this occasion I want to pay a justly deserved tribute to the great people of Poland. It is most fitting that we, here in the United States House of Representatives, pause for a moment to contemplate the plight of the brave men and women of Poland now held prisoners behind communism's curtain of repression and brutality.

The constitution adopted 164 years ago demonstrated the faith in democracy and the basic freedoms which characterizes the people of Poland. Their faith has never wavered, despite the continuing ordeals they have undergone throughout the years.

Tragedy begets tragedy. The significance of this statement is readily seen when one recalls the suppression, the dismemberment and the partition of Poland throughout the centuries. In their long history, the people of Poland have had little opportunity to enjoy their inalienable right of freedom. Yet, their devotion to that cause remains paramount.

Today, from behind the iron curtain, we hear reports of heroic action on the part of these people who refuse to bend to the oppressors' demands, and who refuse to accept slavery as a normal state of mankind. The process of freedom is very slow, and although today we do not hear of any violent revolutions, there are definite actions on the part of the people and the Government of this country which are small tokens of assurance to the Polish people, and people of other nations, that are now being denied their God-given right of freedom. These tributes today, I sincerely hope will reach the hungry ears of all freedom loving people everywhere, for it is often said that the fires of freedom burn hottest among the oppressed. Lip service is not enough, however. We, who enjoy full freedom should redouble our efforts to restore Poland to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Acts of impunity and incidents of disdain are everincreasing. These incidents will grow and multiply until the Polish people will once again shake themselves loose of these parasitic ag-

gressors and regain their rights and the freedom to which all God-fearing people are entitled. Such incidents will become more frequent until atheistic communism is a thing of the past, and once again the Polish people are free to worship their own God—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

It is not within the order of things that wrong shall triumph over that which is right. The day of freedom for that brave country will soon be at hand. The day that every Pole has visualized since the proclamation of their now dormant constitution will return.

Mr. Speaker, in this world beset with atomic hypertension, and with the imminent threat of global warfare let us take heart as we look to the courageousness of our Polish brethren. Let us redouble our efforts for peace in the world and the restoration of liberty and self-government to Poland and other freedom-loving nations now under Communist rule.

Justice for Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning justice for the island of Cyprus:

JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS

Last December the United Nations General Assembly voted to postpone indefinitely any further consideration of the Cyprus question. The United States delegation supported the move. Unfortunately, this indefinite postponement has not made the problem melt away, and while it exists, the ill feeling it generates between the NATO partners, Greece and Great Britain, will continue to complicate western unity and give comfort to the Communists.

House Concurrent Resolution 26, introduced on January 6, puts us squarely on the side of justice; it declares that Congress favors the United States delegation to the United Nations taking "all possible steps expeditiously to bring about consideration by the United Nations of the question of self-determination of the population of Cyprus." I wholeheartedly support this positive stand. Cypriots ask only their God-given right to determine for themselves under which flag they wish to live. They should not be denied the rights that many of them, as well as Americans, defended on the battlefield.

For many years residents of Cyprus have been pleading for reunion with Greece. They have good reason: The great majority, or about 80 percent of citizens of Cyprus, are Greek, that is, Greek in language, Greek in church, Greek in culture. Although the island has been governed throughout the ages by a succession of foreign powers, Cypriots have clung to their Hellenic ties. Centuries of domination by Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Romans, and Turks could not eradicate the Hellenic inclinations of the people of Cyprus. The present occupying power, Great Britain, first got a foothold on the island in 1878 under an agreement with Turkey

to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russia, but Cyprus remained a Turkish possession. Great Britain formally annexed Cyprus in 1914 when at war with Turkey. The ensuing 4 decades of British rule no more erased Cypriot yearning for reunion with Greece than had previous occupations. Over the years various appeals made to England to permit union with Greece were to no avail. As late as 1950 in a plebiscite organized by the Archbishop of Cyprus, the vote showed that 95.7 percent of the 215,000 voters favored union with Greece.

The British have sought our support in denying self-determination to Cyprus on the grounds that the island is vital to safeguarding Mediterranean bases. The strategic value of the island is undeniable. But Western defense will not be affected by a transfer of sovereignty. Greece is a vital partner of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and has already demonstrated how valiant it can be against the Communist threat. It seems to me, also, that the base could be better maintained if the surrounding population were friendly citizens of Greece rather than hostile subjects of Britain.

It behooves the United States to boldly uphold those principles of freedom and independence for which Cypriots cry out. Although the island is small and the population only a little more than 500,000, it is unworthy of our traditions to turn a deaf ear to Cypriot pleas. To continue to ignore Cypriot aspirations would be a mockery of the ideals we cherish. Let us, then, support House Concurrent Resolution 26 so that we may hasten the day when justice is done in Cyprus.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1955, the people of Poland, long oppressed by the Nazis and now enslaved by the Communists, cry out for freedom. Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday is a symbol and rallying point of her people. A day that signifies an unrelenting search for independence—an independence lost when the Russian Army under the pretext of freeing Poland in reality destroyed her independence.

The Polish people oppose the Communists at every turn and in every way they can. Such opposition is certainly to be encouraged and the people supported in their efforts to be free. The Poles cannot, of course, object in an organized way on a national level, but they can be given the comfort and assistance of the free world. The Polish-Americans of our great country are their greatest source of encouragement and by their example may do much eventually to assist them in their quest for liberation.

The need for a free and independent Poland was recognized by former President Woodrow Wilson when he made it one of his famous 14 points announced in January 1917. Our present Government recognizes this goal and should do

everything it can to attain it. The warm friendship of the Polish people for Americans is evident and this mutual admiration is the strongest link in the chain of freedom that will some day replace the yoke of communism.

Upon the occasion of the celebration of this important day in the lives of the Polish people, I wish to add my congratulations and my sincere desire to assist in achieving their complete independence.

Loyalty Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day program in Oshkosh, Wis., on Saturday, April 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGER OF "SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY"

I am pleased to address this great patriotic occasion.

This is the climax of a great and unforgettable day here in Oshkosh.

Today, the people of this industrious area have participated in and have themselves been thrilled by an inspiring demonstration of Americanism.

You have seen in the musical units, the impressive floats, the marching uniformed heroes—a living symbol of the real strength of America.

TRIBUTE TO VFW

It is particularly a delight to appear here under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, among other outstanding groups.

Certainly, there is no group in our Nation which is more entitled to hold aloft the banner of American patriotism today and any other day—than is that group of men who served this Nation on the field of battle—in foreign lands, on foreign seas and in foreign skies.

You gentlemen of the VFW and your wives and children and other loved ones know directly what it is to give your all for your country.

Today you are reaffirming your own fervent dedication to America. And everyone here, taking inspiration from what you have personally achieved previously on the battlefield, and what you are doing today joins in this rededication.

In Washington, it has been a pleasure to cooperate with the Veterans of Foreign Wars national office in securing observance throughout the Nation of May Day—Loyalty Day.

This day is but one of a great many achievements which are well credited to the outstanding record of the VFW. That record is part and parcel of the overall American saga—a saga which dates from Lexington and Concord onward through Belleau Wood and the Argonne Forest and Normandy and Inchon. It is the saga of sacrifice which has helped make America the strongest, the freest, soundest nation in the world today.

LOYALTY FROM WITHIN

Now, although we here today have concentrated on the outward evidences of patriotism—with the Star Spangled Banner flying before us, we know that the real meaning of loyalty is the meaning from within.

Loyalty is a quality of mind, an attitude of heart. Loyalty is the unseen flag which waves silently within us. It is the national anthem on our lips, even though it is not being sung at that very moment.

Loyalty is gratitude for the most priceless blessings that any people have ever enjoyed. Loyalty is the determination that this magnificent heritage which is ours, shall not be bartered away or dissipated, but rather that it shall pass on—in fact—to succeeding generations.

Loyalty is something that you cannot force; it either exists spontaneously or it does not exist. Either men and women really believe in their country; either they would honorably live and, if necessary, die for it; or they have doubts about their country and a feeling that there is some superior system—some totalitarian system.

Fortunately, the number of individuals with such doubts is relatively few, and yet I shall speak to you today on those in our land who are loyal but do not live their loyalty. They sincerely love their country, but they do not lift their hands and their hearts for it, and so their loyalty becomes an idle thing which lacks real meaning because it is not applied.

LOYALTY WEAKENED BY INDIFFERENCE

It is a loyalty weakened by ignorance and indifference.

Ignorance of what?

Indifference to what?

Ignorance of the problems and the dangers and the challenges of our time.

Now, let us turn to the dangers, first of all.

THREE DANGERS TO US

There are, as I see it, three great dangers to us today. They are:

1. The foreign threat of international communism—the menace of aggressive Soviet imperialism;

2. The menace of subversive activity right here at home; and, finally,

3. There is a menace which I shall call the threat of subversive inactivity.

THE MENACE OF RED IMPERIALISM

Now, you are all familiar with the first phase of the threat—the danger of Soviet imperialism—which already controls one-third of the world's people and one-fourth of the world's land surface.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the largest ground forces in the world at its command: The 175-division Red army; the massed millions of Red China; the half-million men of the Soviet satellites in eastern Europe.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the second largest navy in the world, including the largest of all U-boat fleets and the largest air force in the world.

You are aware that the Soviet Union is proceeding at full speed for the development of a program of intercontinental guided and ballistic missiles.

The ballistic missiles in particular may be able, in a matter of years, to reach the city of Oshkosh at a speed of 10,000 miles per hour. Thus, possibly in half an hour, after being fired from a Red launching site, they could explode with nuclear warheads right in our midst.

Against intercontinental ballistic missiles, flying at supersonic speed, there is today no known defense. Not even the Nike guided missiles, which today ring Milwaukee and other major cities, are defense against the ballistic missiles which may be produced in a matter of years. Why? Because the

intercontinental ballistic missile is like a bullet.

It would not be guided by electronics and so it probably could not be jammed by electronics. It would simply be fired like a bullet or an artillery shell and once it were to start, it might not be stopped except by hitting something.

This, then, is an example of danger of Soviet imperialism.

But there is a danger more immediately confronting us.

BEWARE OF RED CHINA'S WORDS

Today, our eyes are principally directed against the menace of aggressive Red China. For weeks and months, the Peking radio has been shouting boastfully of its intention to use force to capture the key island of Formosa.

The United States, in solemn treaty and by near unanimous resolution of its Congress, is soundly determined to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas. Why? Because they are bulwarks of our chain of defense.

Then, at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia came the indication from Chinese Red Premier, Chou En-lai, that he was willing to talk over the attainment of peace in the Formosa Straits.

Because we want peace, we hope that he means what he said. However, the past Communist record is full of such chronic treachery, such double-crossing, so many repeated reversals that we must remain wary and vigilant. The Reds blow hot, and the Reds blow cold. They talk peace one day and war the next day, and peace the third day. Obviously, we can never place real confidence in their words. The only thing which speaks is their deeds.

Let them therefore agree to an immediate cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. Let them release the unjustly imprisoned United States airmen, and other American prisoners. Let them prove their words. Let them not try to use Formosa peace talks as a cover for aggression elsewhere—as in Southeast Asia.

And let us not be gullible. Let us not be naive.

Let us not of course assume that peace in the Formosa Straits is impossible and that nothing can be done to prevent a United States-Red Chinese collision. But at the same time, let us not go to the opposite extreme of assuming that the Chinese Red dragon is overnight going to change its fundamental, imperialistic character.

Vigilance requires us to be as wise as serpents and as gentle as doves.

The loyal American is the vigilant American. He is loyal in support of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, in whose hands lie one of the heaviest responsibilities which has ever been conferred on an American President.

THE DANGER OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

But, now, I want to turn to the second danger to which I earlier referred. It is the danger of Soviet-directed subversive activity here at home. It is the danger of the Alger Hisses, the Judith Coplons, the Klaus Fuchs, the Julius and Ethel Rosenbergs, and other traitors in the midst of the free world.

John Edgar Hoover, able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has estimated that there are 22,000 members of the United States Communist Party today.

This means 22,000 agents of Soviet imperialism, 22,000 individuals whose loyalty is first to the Soviet Union—first, last, and always to the Soviet Union.

Moreover, the estimate has been that for every member of the Communist Party, there are up to 10 fellow travelers.

They are ready, willing, and eager to do the Communist Party work, but they are not willing to be identified outright with the Red conspiracy.

They are, however, just as much a menace, if not more so, than the active Reds.

And let me point out that there are uncounted numbers in what might be called the Communist reserve. They have never been identified directly or indirectly with the Communist conspiracy, even as fellow travelers.

These are really the top servants of the party. They have been instructed absolutely to avoid all contact with Communist publications, individuals, or groups. They are entirely held in reserve for top-secret work and for the most critical future occasions. These are the sort of secret agents who might even slip through a security-screening system, because their record might show no subversive affiliation in the past.

Against the domestic menace of Communists, fellow travelers, and secret Red reservists, I, for one, have introduced numerous anti-Communist bills in this Congress, as in previous Congresses.

One of my bills is to increase the penalties for seditious conspiracy. Still another bill is to strengthen the statute for immediate registration of foreign agents who have been trained in espionage, sabotage, and similar efforts.

I hope these bills will be enacted in the 84th Congress.

THE MENACE OF SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY

But finally now, my friends, I want to refer to a third threat, and this is one which may not have occurred to some people.

I refer to the threat of subversive inactivity.

What do I mean by that?

I refer to the type of do-nothing, think-nothing, sense-nothing American citizen who nonetheless feels he is loyal to our country. He says he loves America and everything it stands for. He does despise communism and all things totalitarian.

But this type of American is unwittingly subversive, because of his sheer inactivity.

Unlike active Americans such as you in this fine audience, the type of person I am describing just doesn't bother about his civic responsibilities. He won't stir himself except for his own selfish needs.

He probably doesn't vote. He doesn't have an interest in government. He never shows up at public meetings. He doesn't inform himself. He doesn't take any interest in his neighborhood or in his community or in his church.

He doesn't know the names of his public officials. He doesn't work in his Parent-Teacher Association. He doesn't look after proper thinking and behavior by his youngsters. He doesn't know much about the world.

He is only interested in making a living for himself, but not in making a real life.

Now, preoccupation with one's personal problems may be understandable because, after all, each of us gets tied up now and then in personal affairs.

Let us be frank and admit that all of us at times may be somewhat remiss in doing our share as active citizens. No one is perfect. All of us can achieve still more in service of our country. But I am not talking about occasional oversights or missing a few responsibilities now and then. I'm talking about the man who chronically doesn't care at all. This type of care-nothing, do-nothing individual does his country no good, does himself no good, because he is unwilling to take active steps to protect his country.

By his inactivity, he unwittingly weakens America, weakens its fiber, its vigilance, leaves it and its institution unprotected.

And so, I say, my friends, let us reduce the ranks of this man I have described as unwittingly subversive. Let us all recognize that we can become even better Americans like the heroes whom you and I have seen with pride today—the heroes of our battlefields.

The man who is truly loyal to America is the man who fights as well on the battlefield of peace. He tries to take an active role in government, to the extent that he can. He is a constructive citizen. He is a churchgoer and religion really is a force in his life. He tries to do his part to make his community the finest possible community in which he and his family can grow and thrive. He encourages good influences in his neighborhood—wholesome sports and recreation.

He keeps himself informed about what is going on in his country and in his world. He casts an intelligent ballot. He listens to public speeches. He reads and listens to the news carefully. He doesn't accept anybody's synthetic thinking. He thinks for himself. He is not afraid to trace ideas down to their lair, instead of merely thinking superficially.

This is the sort of patriot we need—the man who fulfills his American role in the finest sense of the term.

CONCLUSION

We can all strive to be like this man. We can all improve. And seeing this wonderful audience today assures me that Oshkosh will never be found lagging in doing its part.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today. It is a pleasure to join with you in this rededication to all that we hold dear. Rededication is the loyalty from within.

It is thanks to efforts such as your own that we will keep our country strong and free. Thus, forever more, freemen everywhere can look to this land for that standard to which, in the words of the father of our country: "The wise and the honest may repair."

Trans World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess of Congress it was my good fortune to go on the "press flight" which Trans World Airlines scheduled to introduce to the public its great new airplanes, the super-G Constellations. On this 10-day trip we visited 3 countries—Ireland, Egypt, and Spain. Of course, we saw many interesting places and people. But the most interesting and encouraging experience that I had was to come to understand what an outstanding job of building international goodwill this great corporation, TWA, was doing in the three countries we visited. I found that not only was the company respected and admired for its efficient operations, but that by its employment and other policies as well as the attitude of its American employees, TWA was doing much to build goodwill for the United States of America.

At a time when there are so many reasons to be concerned by difficult problems in the field of foreign policy, it is truly a pleasure to be able to report that an American enterprise on its own initiative and following a policy of intelligent and enlightened self-interest is doing a real job of improving international understanding.

Austrian-Russian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days there has been considerable publicity given to the four-power Austrian treaty negotiations. It appears that our State Department in its overly zealous desire to secure any type of peace treaty is altering the time honored position of the United States of the protection of oppressed peoples. The United States is about to allow the repatriation of thousands of Russian Nationals who have found asylum from Communist terror in the free zones of Austria. The American people are entitled to an explanation and to a statement of the position of our Department of State concerning article 16 of the Austrian Treaty. They are entitled to know, whether before the United States approves this treaty, the more than 30,000 Russian refugees now living in Austria will be protected, and will not be forced to return to Russia to face the hangman's noose.

Article 16 of the Austrian Treaty provides for the repatriation of all displaced persons now living in Austria; for free visitation to displaced person camps or centers by Soviet representatives for the purpose of coercing such persons into returning to Russia; it prohibits in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the U. S. S. R. and any activities designed to induce such persons not to return to Russia; it dissolves any organizations existing in such camps which may be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of Soviet Russia; and it refuses relief or aid to those persons who refuse to return to Russia.

If article 16 is allowed to remain in this treaty, the United States will be a party to the massacre of thousands of persons whose only crime is a love of freedom. Our State Department must assure the American people of its firm stand against article 16.

I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 3, 1955, which I believe clearly summarizes the effect of article 16 of the Austrian Treaty:

THIRTY THOUSAND LIVES

"The Austrian treaty negotiations are a case study for the free world. They can be a lesson for those who still trust the Soviet word. . . .

"They are a story of broken pledges on one hand and frustrated hopes on the other . . . an illustration of the methods employed by the Soviet Union to exploit other people and other nations."

Until a month ago that was the State Department's description of 10 years' futile efforts to negotiate an Austrian treaty with the Soviets.

Those 10 years of Soviet duplicity should not be forgotten unless the Soviets at the current negotiations in Vienna give startling and positive proof of genuine change.

An early test of Soviet intentions—whether they want an honest, decent treaty or have only another propaganda gimmick up their sleeves—could be made on Article 16 of the draft treaty. It may affect the lives of 30,000 refugees in Austria—refugees from communism—and other thousands who may in the future get through the Iron Curtain.

Article 16 compels Austria "to take all necessary measure to complete voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory"; to enter bilateral negotiations with Iron Curtain countries for their repatriation; to permit Soviet officials to "visit freely" refugee camps; to prohibit propaganda against the allies, meaning Russia. It also prohibits Austria from giving any relief "to persons who refuse to return to their native countries."

There are many legal arguments claiming this article is obsolete and would not apply to refugees now in Austria. They seem to forget the Soviet ability to twist agreements to their own diabolical uses. There is one certain way to protect these refugees—delete the article from the treaty.

Some argue that it is a harmless article because it refers only to "voluntary repatriation" and therefore, could not be used to force people to return home. But they overlook the tricks the Soviets play on words.

We have signed many agreements and treaties with the Soviets calling for "free elections." But we learned, too late, that in Communist language "free elections" mean rigged elections. Likewise with "democratic" governments, which turned out to mean Communist governments, and "independent" states, by which the Soviets meant satellite states.

What is the Soviet definition of "voluntary repatriation"? Experience should have taught us that it is forced repatriation.

The United States and other Western allies engaged at the close of the war with the Soviets in forced deportation, forced expulsion, and forced repatriation of people. It was a shameful practice then. It would be even more shameful now to be hoodwinked into loosely written treaty articles which would raise any doubts about our opposition to such practices.

Article 16 in the draft treaty must go.

For 10 years the Soviets have ruthlessly exploited the Austrian Nation and people. We understand Austria's overwhelming desire to get rid of the Red army. But a treaty which includes articles like No. 16, which deny Austria full sovereignty, would merely legalize the Soviet right to continue exploitation she has been carrying on illegally for 10 years.

Dillon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the Civil Works

Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to urge that the committee amend the pending appropriations to include funds for the Dillon Dam. At this time, I should like to call the attention to the Members of this House to the situation which exists with respect to this worthy flood-control project. I believe those Members whose congressional districts are periodically visited by flood disasters in the Ohio and lower Mississippi Valleys may be particularly interested in this issue. My remarks are as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the occasion for my appearing before this committee this morning is to appraise the membership of the status of one of the important flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers, which is a part of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers.

The particular project to which I refer is known as the Dillon Dam or Reservoir, located on the Licking River, in the 15th District of Ohio, at a point 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers near Zanesville. The project was authorized in section 4 of Public Law 761 of the 75th Congress, enacted on June 28, 1938.

Work was commenced on this project in 1946, and after an expenditure of \$9,189,800 it now stands at about one-third of completion. Approximately \$17,900,000 is yet required to complete the project. Active construction work on the project was suspended several years ago, and since the suspension the area has been permitted to erode and deteriorate.

The purpose of my appearance here this morning is to recommend to the committee that the appropriation bill under consideration at this time be amended to include provision for this project—at least to the extent of the \$2 million figure last sought by the Corps of Engineers to provide for continued construction for the ensuing fiscal year.

In support of my urgent recommendation, I would prefer to direct the committee's attention to the need for the project, rather than to the dimensions and detail of the dam and reservoir. The plans have been in existence for a great number of years and are contained in the planning report, Dillon Reservoir project, Licking River, Ohio, Ohio River Basin, prepared by the Huntington, W. Va., district office of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in January 1954. The project and its jurisdiction have already received the approval of the Congress many years ago. This approval was endorsed in succeeding years through the provision of funds aggregating \$9 million in authorizations for construction.

Those questions having been disposed of in the past, my purpose today is to point out the compelling need which lies behind the project. If any of the members here have witnessed the devastating effects of a flood along the Ohio or Mississippi River, they are aware of the waste, the death, and the destruction which are regularly visited upon this area. It is not difficult to understand that the waters which create those flood conditions do not originate with the major rivers, but come from the waters of smaller streams many miles away. The floods cannot be controlled by dikes or dams along these major streams. Control must come from upstream along the tributaries draining the area where the floods originate.

In 1938 the Flood Control Act was passed to provide a comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. An integral part of this plan included safeguards for the people and property of Zanesville, McConnelville, Marietta and the other communities along the Muskingum River. Through the control of the rampaging Muskingum, a large measure of protection could

be achieved for those who live in the major river valleys below. Congress then saw the validity and need for the plans contained in the legislation and authorized sufficient funds to build the dams and reservoirs to help hold back the floods and relieve the burden of the Ohio River at peak times. Fourteen dams were constructed on other tributaries of the Muskingum River. Dillon is 15th and the last link to complete the control program. It was designed to hold the Licking River, a major tributary of the Muskingum. The Licking River forms 29 percent of the uncontrolled watershed area. Until it is finished, the Muskingum is still rambunctious. The floods continue to have their devastating effect along the 77.6 miles from the city of Zanesville to the mouth of the Muskingum at Marietta, inundating, destroying, killing, and wasting. Industries and homes in the communities feel the periodic effect of the floods. Had the Dillon Dam been completed this last link in the control pattern would prevent this regular and unnecessary visitation of disaster and havoc in the river valley.

I readily understand that it is indeed difficult for this committee and the Corps of Engineers to make a decision as to the relative merits of the projects to be considered. In a plan so widespread in its effect as this one for the flood control of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers, each individual reservoir is doubtlessly a worthy one. But I must respectfully point out that with Dillon, it is not a question now of making a decision. That decision was made by Congress in 1946 when construction was begun and by succeeding Congresses which voted approval of the more than \$9 million that has been expended. After that great sum of money had been expended, after approximately 800 landowners have been faced with the prospect of displacement and have abandoned any long-range plans with respect to the use of their properties, the Congress has failed to authorize additional funds to complete the project. The temporary halt occasioned by the Korean conflict has begun a permanent deferment of Dillon. As a result, \$9 million of the taxpayers' money has been spent with no benefit realized. No benefit will be realized from the investment until the project is completed. Instead of sorely needed flood control, costly confusion on a broad scale has resulted. Eight hundred landowners along the Licking River do not know whether to plant corn, fertilize, build fences, improve their buildings or to await the condemnation proceedings they have expected for so long. Meanwhile, work costing \$9 million is deteriorating and depreciating by erosion and rust and the destruction of periodic floods continues inexorably. The expenditures have had the same futile effect as though we had flung them into the raging, muddy floodwaters of the Muskingum.

Mr. Chairman, I know you will be the first to raise your voice against such a glaring waste of Federal funds—the tax money of your constituents and mine. The Corps of Engineers has justified the expenditure, but there is no benefit from an uncompleted project.

Here are cold facts with regard to the Dillon project, in addition to the compelling ones of the previous approval by the Corps of Engineers and of the Congress. Dillon would reduce the crest of the 1913 flood by 4 feet at Zanesville, a city of more than 40,000 people, and would have reduced the peak flow into the Ohio River by 32,000 cubic feet per second. Control of those 32,000 cubic feet per second, now, one-third completed at Dillon, would play an important part in controlling the flood level at Ironton, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, and Cairo. Dillon would raise the controlled drainage area of the Muskingum watershed from 62 to 73 percent. The present completed reservoirs have reduced the frequency of damaging floods, but

Dillon would reduce this frequency to once in 50 years. No flood of record subsequent to 1913 would have inundated, even the low-lying areas, had Dillon been completed.

The reasons of 1938 when the plan was authorized and the reasons in 1946 when the first money was spent are still valid and compelling reasons for the completion of the dam today. The need was imperative then. It is imperative now. In fact, there are new and additional reasons along the banks of the Muskingum and Ohio Rivers. These valleys have assumed new importance industrially with the completion of the new \$40 million power project at Beverly which, combined with the Philo powerplant, provide a tremendous source of electric power. These installations have, in turn, spurred industrial interest from all over the Nation and new industries are going up all along the rivers to use the electric power generated there. The coal and chemicals to supply and supplement the huge atomic-energy project in southern Ohio and to carry into effect America's new program for the decentralization of industry are a significant segment of our national defense planning in which the Dillon Dam is a valuable key.

Mr. Chairman, with these as my reasons, I urge and earnestly request that this subcommittee recommend the amendment of the present appropriation bill to include a sufficient amount for the Dillon Reservoir project to permit construction to be carried out in the ensuing fiscal year.

The Need for an Adequate National System of Civil Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on April 27, 1955, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting speech before the Airport Operators Council in Seattle, Wash., concerning the need for an adequate national system of civil airports. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE AIRPORT OPERATORS' COUNCIL, SEATTLE, WASH., APRIL 27, 1955

I can see no reason for telling this audience how pleased I am that you invited me to be your speaker tonight. Give a Senator the opportunity of coming home, add to that the opportunity to make a speech, and arrange that his home is the State of Washington, and you have made him happy. I know you can see how good I feel over the whole business.

You know, we deal in superlatives on the Senate floor—sometimes. My Kentucky colleagues have a poem they quote now and then which is loaded with superlatives, and I often feel like rewriting it for my State. They say "Moonlight falls the softest in Kentucky, and summer days come oftenest, in Kentucky."

Well, I doubt that, it's just an example of exaggerated State pride.

But I do know that here in Washington we have the biggest, most beautiful dogwood blossoms in the whole land. And

none of you has ever seen a city with more perfect reasons for picture windows than my home town of Seattle.

That same Kentucky poem has some final lines that I think all of us here will deny. I've heard some of your discussions and I know now that every one of you face problems much greater than those faced by the other fellow. But Kentucky says: "Mountains tower grandest, politicians are the blandest, And politics the damndest in Kentucky."

Now we all know that isn't true. I'll stack the great Northwest up against any other part of the country, politics, airports, aviation developments, and all.

Of course, you cannot take a sectional view of aviation. This industry is nationwide; yes, worldwide—too big in scope for us to narrow our vision. Each of you can be most interested in your special airport, but you will agree that your airport's most important aspect is its relation with the rest of the world.

Not long ago, speaking on transportation, before State officials of the western States, I pointed at a few of the special conditions that obtain in these States in relation to transportation. I said that airplanes are contemptuous of distance and terrain obstacles, and that—along with the great distances we have out here—makes air transportation especially valuable to us. The results are good loads for the air carriers, and widespread use of the airplane in agriculture and business.

The CAA estimates that owners of 35,070 planes, 57 percent of all that flew in 1953, reported that they did some business flying in that year. That is not surprising to us here in the West. Every day we see ranchers, farmers, contractors, oil-well operators, doctors, merchants, and salesmen using their personal planes to cover great distances and transact business. This business use of what we might call the private plane is growing steadily—rising from 29 percent right after the war to 57 percent in 1953. The personal airplane is doing what the personal automobile has been doing—a promising development, I think.

The airplane is doing great things in agriculture out here, too. At least five new planes, new in design and structure now are being produced for the aerial applicator—a very practical and businesslike example of how firmly this use of the airplane is established in this Nation's food- and fiber-producing business. The CAA estimates that every person in the United States eats, touches, or wears something every day of the year that an agricultural airplane has treated beforehand.

So we have a great stake in the airplane out here where our business transportation needs are great and our crops include food, forests, fruits, and forage crops.

And thus, it follows, we have a great stake in airports. Growth of aviation depends always on adequate airports.

I would commend you men for the progress you have made with your airports. You share a great part in the progress we have made in air transportation. You helped produce the record volume of nearly 35 million air passengers in 1954, and the safety record of eight-tenths passenger fatalities per 100 million passenger-miles. Without fine airports, properly run, neither of these records would have been possible.

But we must again refrain from taking a narrow view in aviation. Yours are the large airports—but what of the small one?

The CAA has prepared three interesting charts which show most graphically how interdependent all airports are in this country. One chart is centered on Los Angeles, and the cities and towns of the rest of the country are represented by dots of various size indicating how many passengers flew from those places to Los Angeles. You would

expect many people to fly from Chicago or New Orleans to Los Angeles, but what about traffic from the smaller towns? All the figures surprised me. From Presque Isle, Maine, 800 passengers flew to Los Angeles; from Savannah, 500; from Spokane, 10,000; from Kokomo, Ind., 500; from Des Moines, 5,000; and from Huron, S. Dak., 600.

A second chart showed, with the same surprising results, the traffic from big and little places all over the country to New York.

These two charts show, for instance, that people in Scottsbluff or North Platte, Neb., are interested in there being adequate airport facilities in New York, Los Angeles, and for that matter in all major cities. Likewise, the people in both New York and Los Angeles are interested in adequate airport facilities in Scottsbluff and North Platte.

The third chart showed another aspect of today's aviation in which you are actively interested. The CAA checked on the business flying of the J. I. Case Manufacturing Co., and drew lines on a map to show where the executive planes of the company flew. Despite the fact that Case has but three planes, and many companies have five times that many, they covered practically the entire country in this 1 year of business flying—using 395 airports.

These charts point up, impressively, a point which you already know—that the importance of any airport must be measured in its relation to every other airport. How would you like to be the proud owner of the only telephone in the United States? Or how long would you hold the job of manager of the only airport in the United States?

Airports, as such, mean no more to me than to the average air traveler or citizen, but I have worked long and hard in Congress to bring about a more intelligent and more productive attitude toward the problem. For that matter, I worked hard for the airport here in Seattle.

I can assure you the Congress recognizes the full importance of the airport program. Its record of legislation and appropriation has been commendable and has reflected the conviction that Federal aid is an essential.

Niggardly Federal assistance in airport development to meet the facility demands of skyrocketing air transportation and interference with Federal commissions in carrying out the expressed will of Congress are two of the most important handicaps we are faced with.

We have before our present Congress a request for \$101 billion for highway construction—but we have also a request for only \$11 million for the entire airport system of the United States. This will hardly provide one airport like the Seattle-Tacoma Airport.

It is true that the need for a nationwide system of superhighways is actual and pressing. That this system should be provided with borrowed money and to 11 roads is a matter for Congress to decide. You are going to have a lot of trouble persuading Wyoming and Montana, for example, to pay their share of such a system. But we need the roads to keep pace with our national growth.

We also need airports. Just as much—if not more than highways. They provide the key to the most essential facility of our national defense. What is more—with our new jet planes we must have large airports and only a few municipalities can provide these.

Unfortunately, the desires of Congress are subverted by actions of the executive branch of Government, and I believe this has been the case in the airport program. The Civil Aeronautics Act and the Federal Aid to Airports Act calls for "the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aviation."

The whole intent of this policy can be changed, however, when the criteria for allowing Federal aid to airports is arbitrarily

set by some official in the executive department. I am becoming more and more convinced that Congress should determine these criteria. It would seem to be the only way in which its wishes can be directed and insured, and the actual intent of its legislation carried out.

In particular, I disliked the exclusion of such items as airport buildings, roads, parking areas and fences, all of which were authorized by the original Airport Act. Nor do I favor the criteria under which the program now is operating—of 30 based airplanes or 3,000 enplaned airline passengers for the airport to be eligible for Federal aid. This criteria can exclude whole classes of airports, which are important in our national system. I know you men recognize that your fine big airports would be decreased in value if we did not have the thousands of smaller airports that serve the people of this country along with you, and send traffic to your fields.

I do, however, look for a change in the administration of this program. When the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate questioned Mr. Louis S. Rothschild before approving his appointment as Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation, we learned that he had a different attitude toward his duties than his predecessor. Mr. Rothschild told us he considered his new post to be one that is concerned with policy matters and should not be an administrative function in any sense of the word. The Secretary of Commerce had previously written me that he conceived of the job of Undersecretary for Transportation in exactly that light—a position of policy supervision, and not of administration. In spite of that we saw continued interference with the CAA and the CAB in their administrative actions. I was especially pleased to hear Mr. Rothschild say that such agencies as the CAA and CAB "have their own powers which should be carried out without leadership or interference from anyone."

I think the CAA and the CAB are in for much more peace of mind and productive effort in carrying through their good work than they have enjoyed heretofore. As I did in the hearings, I want publicly again to commend Fred B. Lee, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, for the good job he has been doing under difficult situations.

Let me review the history of the Federal aid to airports program to illustrate these difficulties. Congress originally authorized \$500 million for a period of 7 years, with not to exceed \$100 million to be appropriated in any 1 year. Now, Congress does not intend that the exact sum of money authorized shall be appropriated and used, but exercises its best judgment year after year in annual appropriations. But note how these appropriations have varied: In 1947, the largest appropriation was made, \$45 million; followed by annual appropriations of \$32,500,000; \$40 million; \$39,500,000; \$24,200,000; \$18,700,000; and \$14,321,154 in 1953. Then, the new administration, in its passion for economy, asked for nothing in fiscal 1954, and our airport development stood by for a year while a committee studied the whole philosophy of Federal aid to airports. That committee, in effect, said to the administration, "Go on as you were with Federal aid, with some changes." Then in 1955, we were asked for \$22 million to help with the rather small program we now have under way. And for next year, the administration has asked for \$11 million.

I would greatly appreciate hearing the views of you men on this matter. Is the Federal Government going about its job intelligently in producing an adequate national system of airports? Is it committed to a sensible, long range policy?

The contrast between our attitude toward highways and airports is disturbing. The

administration has asked for \$101 billion for roads and \$11 million for airports. But the contrast is greater than that. We establish a carefully considered policy in Federal aid to roads that extends 5 years into the future. With airports, we make jittery jumps from year to year, our appropriations ranging from zero dollars to \$45 million in Federal aid. It would seem perfectly sensible to me to treat these two forms of transportation with the same intelligent approach.

This would make for much greater stability in the planning done by airport owners. They face the problem of stage planning in almost every case, and some assurance of Federal participation in these heavy expenses would be beneficial to the whole air transportation industry and to the people who need its services.

Of course, we're outgrowing highways and they have to be replaced, but the same argument holds true for air traffic.

Take Seattle as an example. In 1945, we had 221,428 passengers taking off from Seattle-Tacoma Airport and Boeing Field on passenger planes. Last year, this passenger traffic had doubled that figure, reaching 422,618. Of course, a lot of that traffic was generated on the far-eastern schedule of Northwest Airlines and reflects the Hawaiian service, too.

But it also points up why the CAA has Seattle-Tacoma Airport down for \$310,560 in the Federal aid to airport program to acquire 80 acres of land to clear the approach to the field. And King County Airport—or Boeing Field is in the Federal aid program for \$136,000 to reconstruct a 10,000-foot runway. These Federal funds will be matched locally.

In a matter as important as this, we have to know where we are going.

Congress knew what it wanted and where it was going when it authorized Federal money for aid to airports. For full development of aviation, we must have an adequate national system of civil airports. And I believe Congress feels we have received good value in the airport system so far produced. Since 1947 when the present airport program started, a total of \$236,221,154 in Federal money has been shared with the States to carry through 2,641 projects on 1,204 airports. It is not possible to estimate the value of these airports to the Nation. Presence of an airport has saved the lives of military fliers and their expensive planes in emergencies. New businesses have grown up at airports. Business has accepted the airport as a necessity, and we have classic examples like that of Hickory, N. C., which was selected instead of a nearby town for location of a big manufacturing concern, merely because it had a good airport and the rival city had none. All this in addition to the amazing records broken every year by the scheduled and nonscheduled air carriers.

I do not begrudge Federal money spent in this way. We labor for the future when we build and improve our airports, and it is a future almost too broad and promising for us to imagine.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record

during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification

only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is

scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	do	Election of Speaker (MARTIN, 220; RAYBURN, 201)	MARTIN.
3	Feb. 3	H. R. 1979, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before Apr. 1, 1955. (Passed, 389 to 5.)	Yea.
4	do	S. 245, providing for an Under Secretary of State for Administration. (Passed, 341 to 18.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 19	H. R. 3053, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for VA medical, hospital, and domiciliary services from \$10 million to \$20 million. (Rejected, 180 to 201.)	Nay.
6	do	On passage. (Passed, 369 to 2.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 24	H. Res. 119, providing \$300,000 for expenses of House Un-American Activities Committee. (Adopted, 315 to 2.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 25	H. R. 2332, requiring an annual review of military personnel requirements: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 370 to 0.)	Yea.
9	do	H. J. Res. 160, amending the National Housing Act by increasing FHA's title I loan insurance authorization by \$500,000,000 and providing for repayment of the \$8,300,000 Government investment in this fund to Treasury on or after July 1, 1953: On motion to recommit with instructions to fix interest rate at not to exceed 6 percent per annum on unpaid balance. (Rejected, 70 to 290.)	Nay.
10	Mar. 10	Quorum call.	Present.
11	do	H. R. 3575, admitting Hawaii to statehood: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 182 to 227.)	Nay.
12	do	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 138.)	Yea.
13	Mar. 17	Quorum call.	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	do	Present.
16	Mar. 18	do	Present.
17	do	H. J. Res. 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall take effect 10 days after date of enactment of this joint resolution. (Adopted, 291 to 85.)	Yea.
18	Mar. 19	H. R. 3053, the 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (conference report): On motion to agree to an amendment decreasing borrowing authority for rural electrification program from \$50,000,000 to \$35,000,000 and increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000 (instead of to \$40,000,000 as proposed by Senate). (Rejected, 165 to 191.)	Yea.
19	do	On motion to agree to amendment increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000. (Rejected, 171 to 174.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 25	Quorum call.	Present.
21	Apr. 1	H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 106 to 283.)	Nay.
22	do	On passage. (Passed, 285 to 108.)	Yea.
23	Apr. 15	H. R. 3480, extending for 3 years the period during which Mexican agricultural workers may be made available for employment in this country. (Passed, 299 to 87.)	Yea.
24	do	H. R. 4004, providing for national banks to furnish lists of stockholders to the Comptroller of Currency upon request in lieu of annual filing: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 79 to 239.)	Nay.
25	Apr. 21	Quorum call.	Present.
26	Apr. 22	do	Present.
27	do	H. R. 4663, making appropriations for Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954 (1st independent offices): On motion to recommit with instructions to authorize the start of 35,000 units of public housing in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. (Rejected, 157 to 245.)	Nay.
28	Apr. 24	Quorum call.	Present.
29	do	H. R. 1432, providing price support at 90 percent of parity for 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco. (Defeated, 110 to 212.)	Nay.
30	Apr. 27	S. 1419, authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District: On amendment allowing the Commissioners to institute daylight saving time each year. (Adopted, 250 to 99.)	Yea.
31	Apr. 28	Quorum call.	Present.
32	do	H. R. 4828, making appropriations for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On amendments: To provide an additional \$50,000 for expenses of planning in connection with the Southeastern Power area. (Adopted.)	Nay.
33	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase by \$3,586,000 the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration and to increase from \$38,300,000 to \$42,728,000 funds for Bonneville Power Administration. (Rejected, 167 to 212.)	Nay.
34	May 5	H. R. 4974, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete the sections authorizing the Secretaries of the 3 departments to terminate the employment of any employee whenever they deem such termination necessary in the interests of the United States. (Adopted, 181 to 168.)	Nay.
35	do	On passage. (Passed, 344 to 5.)	Yea.
36	May 13	Quorum call.	Present.
37	do	H. R. 5134, amending the Submerged Lands Act and establishing title of Federal Government and its right to develop resources in submerged lands in the Continental Shelf. (Passed, 309 to 91.)	Yea.
38	do	H. Res. 232, providing for House agreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries. (Adopted, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
39	May 14	Quorum call.	Present.
40	May 19	do	Present.
41	May 20	do	Present.
42	do	H. R. 5227, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On amendment reducing from \$195,000,000 to \$140,000,000 the funds provided for soil conservation payments. (Rejected, 196 to 201.)	Yea.
43	do	On passage. (Passed, 384 to 12.)	Nay.
44	May 25	Quorum call.	Absent.
45	do	H. R. 5246, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies for fiscal year 1954: On amendment increasing from \$60,500,000 to \$66,500,000 the funds allocated for payments to school districts in federally impacted areas. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Nay.
46	do	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to increase by \$25,000,000 the amount allocated for construction of hospitals. (Rejected, 197 to 203.)	Nay.
47	do	On passage. (Passed, 395 to 2.)	Yea.
48	May 27	Quorum call.	Present.
49	June 3	do	Present.
50	do	H. Res. 236, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, simplifying operations of the Department of Agriculture and adapting its administration to regional, State, and local conditions: On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of bill (in effect, to force consideration of the unfavorable resolution by the House). (Rejected, 128 to 261.)	Nay.
51	June 4	Quorum call.	Present.
52	do	do	Present.
53	do	On motion to recommit with instructions not to increase membership of the U. S. Tariff Commission from 6 to 7. (Rejected, 185 to 215.)	Nay.
54	do	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 35.)	Yea.
55	June 10	Quorum call.	Present.
56	do	H. R. 5690, 2d independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954: On motion to agree to amendment deleting language authorizing the VA to investigate non-service-connected veterans statements of inability to pay for treatment or hospitalization. (Adopted, 217 to 180.)	Nay.
57	do	On passage. (Passed, 394 to 2.)	Yea.
58	do	H. Res. 292, providing for consideration of H. R. 5710, extending the Mutual Security Act for 1 year. (Adopted, 340 to 35.)	Yea.
59	June 19	Quorum call.	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
60	do	H. R. 5710, providing 1 year extension of the Mutual Security Act:	Yea.
61	June 22	On passage. (Passed, 280 to 41.)	Present.
62	June 23	Quorum call.	Present.
63	do	H. R. 5659, providing price-support wheat for Pakistan. (Passed, 310 to 75.)	Yea.
64	June 24	Quorum call.	Present.
65	June 25	do	Present.
66	do	H. R. 5728, authorizing disposal of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities:	Nay.
67	June 26	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 58 to 317.)	Present.
68	June 27	Quorum call.	Present.
69	do	H. Res. 295, disapproving of Reorganization Plan No. 6 relating to Department of Defense. (Rejected, 108 to 235.)	Nay.
70	June 27	H. R. 4654, excluding top department and agency officials from provisions of law permitting lump-sum payments for annual leave. On adoption of conference report (which, in addition, repealed requirement that employees use annual earned leave by Jan. 30 of next calendar year). (Adopted, 269 to 65.)	Nay.
71	June 29	Quorum call.	Present.
72	June 30	do	Present.
73	July 1	do	Present.
74	July 2	do	Present.
75	do	H. R. 5969, Department of Defense Appropriation for 1954:	Nay.
76	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase Air Force funds by \$1,175,000,000. (Requested, 161 to 230.)	Yea.
77	July 7	On passage. (Passed, 386 to 0.)	Present.
78	do	Quorum call.	Present.
79	July 8	do	Present.
80	do	H. R. 5173, providing for return to States of all Federal unemployment tax collections in excess of amount sufficient to pay administrative costs and to maintain \$200 million reserve in Federal unemployment account:	Nay.
81	July 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit use of excess taxes to payment of unemployment compensation and to provide for delaying repayment of advances to States. (Defeated, 93 to 292.)	Yea.
82	do	Quorum call.	Present.
83	do	H. R. 6054, amending act of Apr. 6, 1949, to provide for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen in drought areas. (Passed, 387 to 4.)	Yea.
84	do	H. R. 4351, providing for the development of private power facilities on Niagara River:	Nay.
85	July 10	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 130 to 254.)	Yea.
86	do	On passage. (Passed, 262 to 120.)	Present.
87	do	Quorum call.	Nay.
88	do	H. R. 5898, extending until Dec. 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess profits tax shall be effective:	Yea.
89	July 13	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to substitute the provisions of H. R. 6100, permitting companies formed after 1947 to choose any 3 years as the "base" years in figuring the tax. (Rejected, 127 to 275.)	Present.
90	do	On passage. (Passed, 325 to 77.)	Yea.
91	do	Quorum call.	Present.
92	do	H. R. 5710, extending the mutual security program for fiscal year 1954: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 221 to 109.)	Yea.
93	July 15	Quorum call.	Present.
94	do	H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.	Nay.
95	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for international information and educational activities (Voice of America) from \$60,000,000 to \$80,000,000 and to remove language providing for reduction of employees. (Rejected, 154 to 244.)	Present.
96	July 16	Quorum call.	Nay.
97	July 17	H. Res. 262, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8, providing for reorganization of foreign information functions and the creation of a new agency to be known as the U. S. Information Agency: On adoption. (Rejected, 11 to 310.)	Present.
98	July 20	Quorum call.	Yea.
99	July 21	H. R. 4974, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year 1954:	Yea.
100	do	On motion to agree to amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to the U. N. as the representative of China. (Passed, 379 to 0.)	Yea.
101	do	On motion to agree to amendment providing additional \$12,500,000 for Federal aid to airports. (Rejected, 160 to 230.)	Yea.
102	do	H. R. 4663, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954:	Yea.
103	do	On motion to agree to an amendment limiting to 20,000 the number of public housing units to be started in 1954 and barring any future commitments for such housing. (Passed, 239 to 161.)	Nay.
104	do	H. R. 5376, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1954:	Present.
105	July 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to agree to Senate amendment adding \$2,200,000 to the \$278,670,000 recommended by the conferees for flood-control construction projects. (Rejected, 137 to 252.)	Yea.
106	do	Quorum call.	Present.
107	do	H. R. 6391, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1954:	Yea.
108	July 23	On passage. (Passed, 288 to 115.)	Nay.
109	do	Quorum call.	Present.
110	do	H. Res. 347 providing for the consideration of H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act: On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 183.)	Yea.
111	do	H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act and certain other provisions of law to provide adequate protection for American workers, miners, farmers, and producers: On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 242 to 161.)	Present.
112	July 24	Quorum call.	Nay.
113	do	H. R. 5141 creating Small Business Administration to take over lending functions of RFC in this field and to consolidate other activities in behalf of small business:	Yea.
114	July 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 161 to 226.)	Nay.
115	do	H. Res. 217, creating a special committee to conduct investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation. (Adopted, 209 to 163.)	Yea.
116	July 28	Quorum call.	Present.
117	do	do	Yea.
118	do	H. Res. 353, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6481 authorizing admittance of 240,000 special-quota immigrants: On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 152.)	Present.
119	do	Quorum call.	Yea.
120	do	H. R. 6481, authorizing the admittance of 217,000 special quota immigrants:	Present.
121	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 186 to 222.)	Nay.
122	do	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 185.)	Yea.
123	July 29	Quorum call.	Present.
124	do	H. R. 6018, authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States:	Nay.
125	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 114 to 321.)	Present.
126	July 31	Quorum call.	Nay.
127	do	H. R. 6391, making appropriations for the Mutual Security Administration for fiscal year 1954:	Yea.
128	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to insist on disagreement with Senate amendment which added \$211,000,000 aid for Europe. (Rejected, 192 to 200.)	Yea.
129	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Present.
130	do	Quorum call.	Yea.
131	do	H. R. 6672, increasing the statutory debt limit of the United States from \$275,000,000,000 to \$290,000,000,000:	Nay.
132	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit the increase to the period of Aug. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1954. (Rejected, 173 to 225.)	Yea.
133	do	On passage. (Passed, 239 to 158.)	Present.
134	Aug. 1	Quorum call.	Yea.
135	do	H. Res. 361, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6413, permitting withholding by the Federal Government from wages of Federal employees certain taxes imposed by municipalities: On adoption. (Adopted, 192 to 161.)	Yea.
136	do	H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1954:	N. V.
137	Aug. 3	On amendment authorizing dismissal of certain employees of U. S. Information Agency. (Adopted, 147 to 139.)	

Statement by Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, on Deepening of Delaware River Channel

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to accommodate the growing foreign and domestic commerce that utilizes the Delaware River requires an immediate appropriation of \$25 million to commence the 4-year program that such development will require.

I include as part of my remarks the statement I presented to the House Appropriation Committee at the hearing held today in connection with the matter.

It reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, REPRESENTING THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF \$25 MILLION APPROPRIATION TO COMMENCE WORK ON DEEPENING OF DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Appropriation Committee, we are very appreciative of the opportunity you have given to us to appear before your committee and present the facts and figures that, in our opinion, amply justify the inclusion of a \$25 million appropriation at this time for the deepening of the Delaware River Channel.

The deepening of the upper Delaware River Channel has been found economically justified by the business, industrial, maritime, State, and municipal interests of the entire Delaware River area. It has the enthusiastic and aggressive support of each of these.

There is no area in the entire Nation that gives promise of greater expansion than the area within the Delaware River Valley. Industrial, commercial, and maritime interests have made, and are now making, large investments amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars to promote economic expansion of the entire district served by the Delaware River. The importance of this contribution to our national wealth and our national security cannot be disputed.

The Delaware River is the main artery of commerce, foreign and domestic, that serves an industrial and farming area not exceeded by any other river in the entire Nation. At the present time its insufficiency of depth is a great handicap in fulfilling its complete usefulness. The traffic on the Delaware River is seriously hampered by this condition and if it is not speedily corrected the injury wrought upon the commerce of the entire area will be incalculable. Furthermore, we must not overlook the further fact that the Delaware Valley lies in the heart of an area in which there is taking place a rapid industrial and commercial expansion that will require service of ocean-going vessels of a draft in excess of 35 feet.

The resultant financial gain to the United States Treasury is a further justification for an adequate appropriation to deepen the Delaware River Channel. The following figures show that it is just ordinary good business for the Federal Government to invest in the Delaware River:

(a) Customs receipts alone bring \$52 million a year into the United States Treas-

ury. Since 1936, the Federal Government has spent a little over \$100 million on our Delaware River Channel—but since 1900, it has collected almost \$1.5 billion in customs revenue—or a return of \$14 for every \$1 invested.

(b) Every day the Delaware River carries 700,000 barrels of crude oil to feed our great petroleum refineries. With an adequate channel, the large modern tanker can deliver crude oil at least 60 cents per ton cheaper than the smaller tanker which our Government built during World War II. The Navy's Military Sea Transport Service is now asking Congress to authorize the building of 20 such large modern tankers because of their defense value. The yearly saving in transportation costs of \$20 million—for just this one item of our Delaware commerce—will mean a Federal tax revenue of \$10 million.

(c) The Delaware River will handle for the steel industry an estimated 15 million tons of imported iron ores. If we calculate conservatively that the large ore carrier will bring this ore to our dock for 50 cents per ton less than the cost of using smaller ships, the benefit to the Federal Treasury will be almost \$4 million in additional taxes.

(d) Prosperity in our three-State Delaware Valley area depends upon an adequate Delaware River channel. With such a channel, we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal revenue from business and individual taxes. In the last fiscal year, Pennsylvania and New Jersey alone contributed over \$7 billion in internal-revenue collections of all kinds—better than 10 percent of all tax revenues.

In conclusion, I wish to make reference to the strange suggestion that comes to us from the Chief of Army Engineers, namely that local interests pay half the cost of increasing the depth of the Delaware River. This contribution has been estimated at \$18 million.

The Chief of Army Engineers admits that the deepening of the channel as proposed would unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region. But he makes the qualifying observation that the use of channel depths greater than 35 feet will be confined to a single company.

In answer to this suggestion, I reply: Why should an industry be compelled to contribute directly to the cost of a public improvement which benefits not only that industry but a whole region, as the 40-foot channel undeniably would? Even if a private enterprise is willing to shoulder such a charge, should the Government want it to? Would there not be corollary questions of the industry's rights in the improvement it is helping to finance, and of tax deductions? Should an industrial firm whose tax payments help produce public improvements be required also to pay directly for such projects?

If a 40-foot Delaware Channel is in the public interest, as it appears to be, it should be treated as a public improvement, built with public funds—not as part of a corporate investment.

Furthermore, to adopt a policy of required local participation in cost of river and harbor improvements creates a situation that would not only be novel and unique in the Government policy that has heretofore prevailed, but the results could conceivably prove most disastrous by curtailing future expansion of our principal ports and rivers.

Questions immediately arise as to not only the lack of justification for such a policy but also as how such a policy could ever be practically applied in its application. For instance:

1. What is meant by "local interests"? Is this to mean "local industrial interests,"

"local commercial interests," "local maritime or shipping interests," or "local, State, or municipal interests"?

2. If industrial, commercial, or shipping interests are intended, then would it be applicable to the presently existing interests or would it contemplate also contributions from future interests of a similar character? If so, then how would it be applied as between present and future interests?

It can be readily seen that it would be unfair and unjust to apply it only to existing interests as against future interests that would equally benefit, and most objectionable of all considerations, that would naturally grow out of such a policy would be the tendency of new interests to avoid placing their industries or other interests along the Delaware River. Thus it would have a tendency to stifle future development of the whole Delaware River Valley.

3. Furthermore, if such a policy should be adopted as to the Delaware River, then it would be the application of a policy that runs counter to our river development policy since our beginning as a Nation, and in all fairness, would require the application of the same policy to all our rivers and harbors and thus create a situation that would prove most detrimental to port developments throughout our Nation.

Thus I wish to record my objection to the proposal of the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that local interests be required to contribute in cash to the United States one-half of the actual additional cost of construction of the recommended improvement of the 40-foot channel in excess of the cost of a 35-foot channel, and I respectfully urge the committee to report favorably legislation for an adequate amount that will enable this great improvement to be started at the earliest possible day.

Naval Veterans of 1898

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of a letter I have sent to the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Spanish War of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, concerning House Joint Resolution 151.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Spanish War, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am pleased to endorse House Joint Resolution 151, introduced by Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, which was the subject of recent hearings by your subcommittee. A good friend and constituent of mine, Capt. Laurence H. Parker, of Fiskdale, Mass., treasurer-in-chief, Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, has brought to my attention the provisions of this measure and I am hopeful that the subcommittee can take favorable action.

House Joint Resolution 151 seeks to correct an injustice to the naval veterans of the Spanish-American War by placing them on the same basis as those veterans who served in the Army insofar as pension benefits are concerned. With the passage of the years, only some 20 or so surviving naval veterans and widows would benefit from the passage of this legislation.

The naval veterans of 1898 and their dependents are not being accorded the same treatment granted through law to the Army veterans. At present, no pension is allowed the widow of a naval veteran of the combat area, who had as much as 89 days of actual service, whereas a widow of an Army volunteer, with no duty in the combat zone and only 60 days of actual service, receives a full pension. This discrepancy apparently results from the fact that furlough time can be included by Army veterans in the computation of service time while this particular provision of the pension laws has not been extended to the naval veterans.

House Joint Resolution 151 will correct this inequity and I will be thankful for your help in bringing this legislation before the full membership of the House. It would also be a favor to me if you would include this letter in the record when House Joint Resolution 151 is before the full committee for consideration.

With thanks and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Does the Hatch Act Go Too Far?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post an editorial cites a case now pending on appeal in a Federal district court in Vermont which involves the Hatch Act and the rights of an American citizen to freedom of speech.

This case, now known as the Simpson case, involves one, W. Arthur Simpson, who is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare. His job involves administering State funds plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

In October of 1951 Mr. Simpson wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald in which he stated his own personal choice of Senator Robert Taft as Republican candidate for President.

Because Mr. Simpson dared to express his personal opinion as to which candidate he believed to be best suited for nomination by his party for President, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against him charging him with violation of the Hatch Political Activities Act. The basis of this charge was that Mr. Simpson had violated the law in writing his letter.

The State of Vermont was ordered by the Federal commission to fire Arthur Simpson, but refused, and in an effort to force compliance with its order, the Civil Service Commission then told the State of Vermont that the Federal Government would hold out from Vermont's

share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this point Vermont appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier where the case is still pending.

This, in my opinion, is a case bordering on the ridiculous when the Federal Government will invoke the Hatch Act against a citizen who expresses his personal opinion, and signs his name as a private citizen.

The man or woman who enters Government service, either at the Federal or State level, does not renounce all citizenship rights as an individual upon taking such office.

But it would appear this is the view taken by those who administer the Hatch Act, if a man's discharge is ordered for expressing a personal opinion, and an attempt made to force the State to comply with the order by the withholding of welfare aid.

If this is an example of the extent to which those charged with administration of the Hatch Act intend to go in denying the rights of free speech and expression of personal opinion to employees of Federal and State Governments, then I think it is high time we took a long look at the Hatch Act, and consider proper amendments to it, or, perhaps, its repeal, and replacement with better legislation in which the civil rights of Government employees will be protected adequately.

I am fully aware of the importance of keeping Federal employees out of politics. However, the Hatch Act was not enacted to deny to Federal employees the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

Freedom of speech is a privilege which every American cherishes. And so long as a man expresses his own opinion as a private individual, he should be protected in this right. Nor should he live in fear that his job will be taken from him if he exercises this basic right of citizenship.

In the totalitarian state men must live in silence, fearful that any expression of personal opinion not in accord with the will of the government in power will result in immediate retaliation.

Robert Simpson exercised his right guaranteed under the Constitution to express his personal opinion on a matter of importance to him as an American citizen. As a result, the Federal Government ordered his removal from his State position, thus expanding Federal power within a State. When the State refused to comply with this order, the Federal Government attempted to bring pressure to bear on the State government by withholding Federal-aid funds.

This is a situation that cannot be tolerated in the United States. And we should not delay in taking appropriate action to safeguard the right of free speech to every American, regardless of whether he is employed in government service or in private business.

The following article from the Post states the case of W. Arthur Simpson, a citizen in public service who dared express his personal opinion as to a candidate for public office, and was faced with dismissal from office after more than a

third of a century of distinguished service for the State of Vermont:

IT'S HARD TO SEE A "LETTER TO THE EDITOR" AS REALLY IMMORAL POLITICAL ACTIVITY

When W. Arthur Simpson, a Vermont State employee, sat down to write a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald back in October 1951 he had no idea that this exercise of an ancient and honorable American privilege would eventually land him smack in the middle of a State rights fight to determine how much authority over its own affairs a State must surrender in exchange for Federal aid.

Mr. Simpson, a Republican, is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare, a job that involves administering State funds, plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. In the preconvention discussion of the best possible Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Simpson favored Senator Robert Taft. He wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald saying that while he didn't think Robert Taft was the only alternative, "he at least has the virtue of being honest, forceful, a fighter, and a successful campaigner." Surely Mr. Simpson's views should have no more to do with his fitness to hold his job than if he had come out for Senator KEFAUVER.

However, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against the Vermont social-welfare head, charging that he had violated the Hatch Political Activities Act by writing the letter, and by presiding at a session of the Republican State convention in 1950. The Commission did this even though published Federal Security Agency rules and the laws of the State of Vermont seemed to Mr. Simpson to exempt him from the Hatch Act on the ground that he was putting in most of his time for his State, and not for the Federal Government.

The Federal Commission ordered Vermont to fire Arthur Simpson. Vermont refused. The Civil Service Commission then told Vermont that Uncle Sam would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this, the Vermonters appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier, where the case is now pending.

Incidentally, Mr. Simpson has worked for his State quite a while, apparently without trouble. In April 1953 the Vermont Legislature adopted a resolution praising him for distinguished service over more than a third of a century, citing him as a "gracious neighbor and public administrator," and concluding, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Other States are up in arms about what was done to this Vermont Republican, and the expansion of Federal power which it implies. New Hampshire has joined Vermont in the court battle. Indiana, where four State employees have been charged with political activity, seems about to follow suit, with Hoosier Gov. George Craig leading an effort to persuade other States to support a bill by Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Indiana Republican, which would make the Hatch Act apply only to Federal employees.

Lawyers for the State of Vermont urge persuasively that the Federal Government's idea that the Hatch Act applies to anybody who works even part time for a State agency receiving Federal funds could logically involve a State employee serving 1 day or members of any State board or commission financed by \$1 of Federal funds. Such a person couldn't write a letter to the editor on a political matter, even if he didn't write in his official capacity. (Mr. Simpson signed only his name, didn't use his official title.)

Conceding that the Hatch Act was wisely intended to keep Federal employees out of politics, it is certainly doubtful that Congress intended to extend its prohibitions to every

State office that gets a nickel of Federal money or to mere expression of preference for candidates for office. If that is what Congress did intend, a vote on the Beamer resolution provides an opportunity to make the intention plain. In the meantime a vote of thanks is due the Vermont, New Hampshire, and Indiana rebels for bringing the whole thing to light.

The Simpson case may go against them, now that the Federal camel has thrust its head legally into so many local tents. If it does, it will be time for a lot of Americans to get into politics in earnest and reverse the trend by which Federal control of State affairs is assumed as the price of Federal aid. If the Simpson case causes the citizenry to look these Federal gift horses in the mouth, there's nothing wrong with that.

America's Summons to Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, in the city of Los Angeles I was highly honored to speak to a distinguished group of citizens and award-winning students attending the Southern California Christian colleges. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SUMMONS TO RESPONSIBILITY

I am highly honored to speak to each of you tonight. I congratulate the Forest Lawn Foundation on the civic service which it performs in this educational undertaking, and I congratulate, too, the award winners in this 1955 journalism awards contest.

The Foundation brochure suggests that "good writing is the key to leadership." I agree. Good writing depends upon clear thinking. Each is increasingly indispensable to families and to nations alike in their pursuit of a free and contented life on earth, and both represent laudable goals for all of us.

Your brochure also suggests that if 5,000 words are required to cover a given subject, then 10,000 words devoted to it represent wasted time and effort. I agree again. There are some, however, who disagree. I know, because I've seen them.

Two years ago, as a new Member of the United States Senate, I sat in my seat and listened while a new footnote to current political history was being made. One of my colleagues was establishing a new record in the length of a single Senate speech.

He spoke continuously for upwards of 22 hours, commencing early 1 afternoon, proceeding throughout the night, and concluding the following day. I confess I did not hear all of it. I went home to bed around midnight, but when I returned to the Capitol the next morning, he was still going strong. He broke the existing record. Until a Texan talked for 28 hours several weeks ago in his State legislative assembly, my colleague remained the undisputed world champion, in length at least.

In my judgment, my colleague consumed at least 20 hours more than he should have on that occasion. Time is precious; none of us has too much of it. So the purpose of your contest—to write trenchantly and

tersely and clearly—is praiseworthy. And what applies to the written word has equal application to the spoken word.

By the way, I recall the story of the great Winston Churchill during the war. He received a memorandum from a young naval officer that a certain war material was "in short supply." Sir Winston scribbled across the bottom of the memo "What is wrong with the good old Anglo-Saxon word 'scarce'?" I rather imagine that that awkward phrase was not utilized thereafter in official memoranda emanating from at least one member of His Majesty's Royal Navy.

Tonight, I wish to speak to you about the responsibilities of our country and of our people which the passage of time has placed upon us. Our frontiers of pioneer days have long been gone, and western America is on its way toward overtaking the rest of the Nation both in people and in production. Our population continues to grow, and our people live longer than before, and we produce more abundantly than ever. Fulfilling the needs for air to breathe, water to drink, and food to eat constitutes a different problem than our forebears faced. For example, air contamination—at least, to the extent that it poses a hazard to the health of society—is a modern byproduct of industrial progress and it is not indigenous to this community alone. The artesian wells of my grandfather's days in California are vanished; today, our millions of Southern Californians live only because of a vast importation of water into this area. We face the need of a realistic national policy on these problems. Food is a little different. We produce more than we can eat, a tragic paradox in a world which still knows starvation. Our National Government has begun to accept such modern problems in this 20th century. Air pollution has become a matter of Federal, as well as local, concern. Our national Government is undertaking the study of water supply and water conservation on a national basis, and the Congress is grappling with that subject. On the problem of food, we've made progress. Part of our food surplus goes into the schools of this country to assist the underprivileged and the undernourished. Part of it will be channeled into foreign trade, and some of it has been used to prevent starvation abroad. Our Nation's gift of surplus wheat to Pakistan averted a tragic human disaster and helped to cement an international friendship. And our new agricultural legislation is designed to protect the farmer, without bankrupting the taxpayer or putting the Government in the food business.

I need only cite the great change in our Nation's fiscal situation to demonstrate how, in this field, our responsibility is far greater than ever before. Deficit spending has been a modern curse. It never plagued past generations. In 1915 we owed a little over \$1 billion, and today we owe more than \$271 billion. In 1915, we spent less than three-quarters of a billion dollars, and last year over \$67 billion. Forty years ago, just before our involvement in World War I, the public debt amounted to \$10 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Today, the comparable figure is just under \$1,650. Thus Government spending has an increasingly greater effect on our people. Our fiscal policies have a direct impact on the value of our money. They affect private credit and private business. Our Government has attempted—I think with creditable success—properly to discharge this highly sensitive responsibility. We've taken steps towards a balanced budget without attempting to turn back the clock. Federal spending is subject to additional control, and where practicable, has been reduced. Some tax reduction has been adopted to provide an additional stimulus for an expanding economy. If you will let me say so, there is a general aversion, or at any rate a considerable aversion, in

Washington, against fiscal irresponsibility, and that, in itself, is real achievement.

Without question, it is in the field of foreign relations that America's summons to responsibility is of greatest concern. The summons has not been thrust suddenly upon us. As in matters of domestic concern, so too in international affairs, the passage of time has altered our country's responsibilities in the world.

We have been placed into a position of leadership among nations whether we like it or not. Prior to the World Wars in which this country has engaged, our people, through their Government, abstained from the role of a great world power. Our Federal Government was responsible for laws and administration of national problems and internal rights of our people, and very little else. We insulated ourselves in our early days with the Monroe Doctrine, and we saw our interests as a free people confined pretty much to the Western Hemisphere and the North Pacific Ocean. That was what Americans desired. That is what they received from their Government. We held ourselves understandably aloof from international quarrels abroad. Our two oceans afforded us the luxury of separation from European and Asiatic strife. And then we were drawn into a world conflict. Our Government broke off diplomatic relations with Germany by reason of her unrestricted submarine war which caused American ships to be torpedoed and American lives to be lost. American sovereignty had been assaulted and the Congress of our country, at the request of the President, took the Nation into a war and thus we were embarked on a whole new era for our people.

When victory came, the American people, quite understandably, wanted to return to their old way of living. We still enjoyed the barriers of two great oceans. Why muddle and meddle in European affairs? was the question asked in those days. No one offered a satisfactory answer. The United States refused to join the League of Nations. In the decade which followed, "isolation" and "economy" were our national watchwords.

After World War I, our Government made repeated attempts at cooperative international disarmament. But with no great success. While we began to evince some interest in European affairs, our people did not believe that our own security and prosperity depended very much on them. We followed a policy of neutrality with respect to all the world.

World War II brought with it a growing recognition that the security of the United States is affected whenever and wherever the destruction of free government or free people occurs. When that conflict was concluded, and our enemies surrendered unconditionally, we watched with growing apprehension and unbelief as the Soviet Union took advantage of a distraught European Continent, and undertook destruction of the freedom of European countries and the extension of Communism all around the globe.

Meanwhile, technological developments were destroying our traditional concepts of space. The protection afforded us by our dividing oceans was disappearing. The American people were brought face to face with the fact that their favored geographical position was no longer any guaranty to their peace and security.

Thus, in the 1940's, the United Nations was created, and our country, through overwhelming Senate ratification, joined it. We took the lead in its formation. We began to discuss with free peoples our common concern on our common problem of maintaining our respective freedoms in a world at peace. If the future were to bring more acts of brutal aggression, we were determined to agree, in advance, that together we would repel them. Mutual security treaties came

into existence. NATO was born. Our country applied the old principle of "in union there is strength." Collective defense arrangements in many areas of the world were made by our Government. And, thus, what was almost undreamed of in the years gone by became a new United States policy with a great new responsibility.

I wish now to speak with you on one facet of American foreign policy of great importance to the American people today. It concerns the Far East and Asia. I am neither a military expert nor an expert on foreign relations. I speak as an American and as a Member of the United States Senate who has been required to sit in judgment there on matters of American policy in that area. I do not speak in either a political or a partisan manner.

We are agreed, I am sure, that the most important objective of our country's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable world peace.

In the far Pacific and Asia, our summons to responsibility in accomplishing this objective represents a continuing challenge of this Nation's ability to lead. The summons and the challenge have been answered with measurable success, with enlightenment, and with a spirit of helpfulness which characterizes our people; we became a pace setter in creating independent, self-governing nations. We led the march away from colonialism. I wish to recall that on March 22, 1934, Congress granted independence to the Philippines, and on July 4, a fitting date, 12 years later, the Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed a new member of the family of nations. We have no firmer allies in our goal of freedom and of peace than the Filipino people.

Our acceptance of that responsibility in Japan is a demonstrated fact. We set an unprecedented and an inspiring example to the Japanese people almost from the moment occupation forces arrived in those islands. Instead of vengefully punishing an entire race, the United States undertook—and with heartening success, I am proud to observe—to guide, to encourage, and to advise a former foe on building a new government along democratic lines, on rehabilitating a ravaged economy, on lifting the standard of living and on recognizing the dignity of human beings.

We played an important role in establishing SEATO in the Southwest Pacific, as we did in the establishment of NATO. We have led free powers into combining together to deter Communist aggression or Communist colonialism.

Last January, by reason of the critical situation developing in the Straits of Formosa which posed a serious peril to the security of America, our Government stood united in the declaration of our policy in that area. In a message to Congress asking for such a declaration, President Eisenhower recalled that ever since June 1950, when Communism committed armed aggression against Korea, this Nation determined to defend the island of Formosa against possible Communist invasion from the mainland of China. He said: "We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its Charter for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body. * * * The danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

He concluded by saying that this country "shall remain faithful to our obligation as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not in danger."

I quote from the resolution introduced immediately in the Congress:

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."

The resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives almost unanimously, and on January 27 debate commenced in the Senate. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, argued that it was not a question of how much power the President had under the Constitution. In his judgment, the President was right in asking the Congress to pass such a resolution "even if the only reason for so doing was to secure the moral support of the American people."

I want to recall what I said earlier this year in discussing this situation. Every thinking professional military man has unequivocally concluded that Formosa and the Pescadores must not fall into Communist hands. Those islands constitute what they call a part of the defense perimeter of the United States.

That conclusion is not a political conclusion. It was not made by party-minded people. It represented the best thinking of those best qualified from a military standpoint to render it. I assume that our people do not require assurances that the President adopted those conclusions as an American statesman dedicated to our own welfare, and not as a politician. And I am sure that our country approves the bipartisan manner in which the Congress, after debate, adopted the resolution on a basis of your and my right to freedom.

As I listened to the debate, I recalled the phrase which General MacArthur used during Korea when he referred to the area north of the Yalu River as a "privileged sanctuary." And I want to recall again his own words on the stake of our country in Formosa. "Under no circumstances," he told our country, "must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

During the debate, a number of amendments were proposed. One of them was offered by a Republican Senator who was joined by two Democratic Senators. Let me read the text of the amendment: "Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw nationalist troops and civilians from such islands."

The amendment apparently accepted the importance to our own freedom of deterring

Communist aggression in that area of the world so long as we voluntarily prevented ourselves from such deterrence at an imaginary 12-mile offshore limit. If the Communist Chinese were to set off a conflagration aimed at Formosa and the Pescadores, such an amendment would shackle our President with a ridiculous restriction in attempting to deter it. Furthermore, it would present to the Communists a legislative guaranty, in advance, of what we would not do to protect our perimeter of American defense.

Suffice to say, the amendment was defeated overwhelmingly. Other amendments were offered and they, too, went down before bipartisan majorities. A grave conclusion on America's responsibility was reached not by political entities but by an American President and an American Congress who agreed upon an American policy to protect the freedom of the American people.

Our Government, through both the executive and legislative branches, agrees it is in the interest of American security that Nationalist China shall not be abandoned to Communism and that, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, the President is authorized to use our Armed Forces as he deems necessary in their behalf and that authority includes the related islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

By whom do the American people desire to have this authority discharged? Do they wish to have it discharged by our elected Chief Executive as he may determine in accordance with the terms of the bipartisan congressional resolution? That is the way our Constitution provides.

I am convinced that they want this authority exercised, in accordance with the law of the land, and by the head of our executive branch who, after all, is the only person I know possessed of all the facts from day to day, who is the elected head of our people, and who during his lifetime has known the horrors of war and has demonstrated a devotion to peace.

I will not challenge the good faith of those who disagree with me, but I venture to suggest that our bipartisan policy, upon which peace or war could well depend, be not subjected to partisan criticism from either of the two great American parties of our land. The President will make the decision if the exigencies of the days ahead require them. That is the responsibility which the Senate and the House placed upon him. We can be thankful that he has declined to spell out in advance what his decision and his strategy would be under different sets of circumstances if he deemed it necessary to take action.

Some of our citizens have suggested that the United Nations assume jurisdiction of this free-world problem. I believe that it should, and I have included in my remarks tonight the Presidential position that it would be welcomed.

In this connection, I have received an informative letter from Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our Ambassador to the United Nations, in answer to my question of America's position.

Ambassador Lodge wrote that the United States has followed a consistent policy of trying to get the U. N. to take up the question of a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. The United States worked for a meeting of the Security Council, which finally was held. When the meeting occurred, this country showed its good faith and earnestness and took an unusual step to dramatize our desire to bring about a peaceful solution. We voted formally to invite the Chinese Communists to sit in at the talks we hoped would be held about arranging a cease-fire. Ambassador Lodge recalled, and I am quoting his exact words, that "this invitation was contemptuously rejected, to the accompaniment of flagrant untruths and cynical impugning of our motives."

Results of the recent Bandung Conference are heartening. While Communist China has announced somewhat of an about face, only time can tell us whether her spokesmen are in good faith. Yet at the conference, ministers of sovereign nations spoke out against aggression. We had friends there, people of different colors, creeds, and religions, who share our goals of freedom.

Fear of retaliation is not the only deterrent to war. The opinions of peoples are important. The forthright stand at Bandung by the Philippine, the Pakistan, the Ceylon and the Iraq delegates unquestionably had a telling effect on the Communists. They—like others—gathered strength and courage for their stand, I believe, from the leadership which our country and the fraternity of free nations have provided. We are measuring up to the responsibility that destiny has given to us. We are responding to the most important summons of our national life.

The Worcester Telegram Salutes Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to include an editorial, entitled, "Honoring JOE MARTIN," which appeared in the April 28 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, because it truly summarizes the remarkable qualities that have made this great man a national institution in American political life, beloved by all.

The article follows:

HONORING JOE MARTIN

It was a distinguished gathering that honored Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. of Massachusetts, at the unveiling of an oil painting of him, Wednesday at the Capitol Hill Club in Washington. He fully deserved the tributes which he received just as he has deserved similar tributes in the past.

JOE MARTIN is an institution. His Republicanism is of the militant brand. He is a party man, a firm upholder of party loyalty. He requires such loyalty from himself as well as from others. His faithfulness to Republican Presidents, to Republican party leaders, to Republican administrations, has ever been constant.

As a Member of the House, as minority leader, as Speaker, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, as chairman of the Republican congressional (campaign) committee, and as permanent chairman of four Republican national conventions, his service to his party has been outstanding.

But far more remarkable than all of that, is the respect and affection in which he is held by Democrats. His political opponents, over the years, have recognized his patriotism, his sincerity, his ability and they have responded to his genuine friendliness. He has no use for triflers or shirkers. He does respect earnestness and honesty, regardless of party.

He likes politics, and he likes those who are in it with him—and they like him. His leadership is built on his personality, and on his character. Republicans and Democrats alike know that he is straightforward, and a man of his word.

The Job Harold Stassen Leaves Unfinished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article written by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, which appeared in the April 7, 1955, issue of the Reporter magazine.

Representative WILLIAMS again demonstrates in this article the keen insight that he possesses and his expertness in the field of foreign affairs. We are privileged that he is serving as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOB HAROLD STASSEN LEAVES UNFINISHED (By Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

Now that Harold Stassen has been shifted to the post of Special Presidential Assistant for disarmament problems, I am more concerned than ever about what is to become of the important work now handled by the Foreign Operations Administration. Mr. Stassen has been the most consistent spokesman within the administration for aid to Asia. The FOA, of which Mr. Stassen has been the chief since its creation on August 1, 1953, is scheduled to expire on June 30.

Does Mr. Stassen's departure foretell the liquidation, or at least the fragmentation, of FOA? Do we have anything to offer the Asians except threats about tactical atomic weapons?

Along with a number of my colleagues in Congress, I have been trying for some months without success to get a clear picture of what the administration plans to do about technical assistance and economic development in Asia. One day Mr. Stassen would seem to favor a Marshall plan or possibly a Stassen plan for Asia. The next day Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, guardian of "responsibility," would deny that any such plan existed. Then Secretary Dulles would clear up the whole issue, as he did during a stopover in Laos, by hinting that all Asia needs on the economic side is a little more trade.

Recently the dust has settled somewhat. In a press conference on March 17, Mr. Stassen announced an administration decision to send up to Congress a foreign-aid program that is to include more public-investment funds for Asia than ever before. Its most striking and praiseworthy feature is to be a "regional fund" amounting to perhaps \$200 million.

Although this is still a compromise bold new program—a little long on statements of the compelling need (Stassen) and a little short on substance (Humphrey)—it will probably resolve the administration's internal fight. But, as Mr. Stassen himself said, it is only a first step in meeting the requirements of our foreign policy in Asia.

CHINA VERSUS INDIA

Economic assistance to Asia is both a necessity and an opportunity for the United States. The final answer to communism is neither conventional nor unconventional weapons but the fulfillment of Asia's economic needs by democratic means. The

contrast is already there—in the respective means by which China and India are trying to catch up with the industrialized nations of the world.

The nations in the non-Communist crescent of Asia must find ways to improve the economic well-being of their people. All of them are watching this competition between India and China.

In China, the Communist leaders are trying to industrialize their nation by imposing greater sacrifices on those who have least to give—the peasants. That, of course, is exactly what Stalin did in Russia. His Chinese followers are now facing the same stubborn fact he faced. No police state has ever figured out a way to force farmers to grow more food. It shouldn't take long for Mao Tse-tung, applying Stalin's theories in a country that has long suffered from large food deficits, to produce a severe food crisis in China. Already there is bitterness and despair.

It is now becoming clear, even to the overseas Chinese scattered throughout southeast Asia, that Communist land reform is strictly a phony; that the tenants who thought they were getting land of their own have wound up as sharecroppers for the Government. No wonder the Communists are beginning to complain in their own newspapers about "dangerous spontaneous tendencies toward capitalism" among the peasants.

The Indians, on the contrary, build up the agricultural sector of their economy rather than exploit it. Nehru's 5-year plan still has a year to run, but it is already possible to talk of its success. Aided by good weather, better fertilizers, more irrigation, some technical advice, and a widening participation in village community projects, India's farmers have already increased grain production by 21 percent, substantially reducing a deficit that ran close to 5 million tons before the plan got under way. According to a New Delhi dispatch in the New York Times, "It can be said now that India is self-sufficient in food." Nehru's government still has many problems to face, but it has clearly demonstrated for the rest of Asia to see that a democratic state can make a success of economic development.

INEVITABLE CONCLUSION

When we turn to Japan we find that a solution to that nation's economic distress lies in the rapid development of south and southeast Asia. Japan's problem is simple: An island crammed with industrial machinery and skilled workers, it needs markets for what it produces and has to import a wide variety of food and raw materials. The Japanese would like to increase their trade with us. But even if we had no tariffs at all, the United States would be a good market for only a small part of what Japan has to export.

The Japanese would like to increase their trade with Red China, too. But here again the potential amount of such trade has been vastly overrated. The Chinese would certainly be eager to buy what Japan has to sell, but China cannot offer much in return except coal and a few odd commodities like tung oil and hog bristles. What would provide a real answer to Japan's trade problem is the rapid economic development of the rest of Asia.

Considerations of both politics and economics thus lead us inevitably to the same conclusion: A vigorous program of economic assistance to Asia should be at the core of United States foreign policy.

THE COLOMBO PLAN

How can the program be carried out? A new and hopeful means is now available to us. The Colombo plan, which was originally a family affair within the British Commonwealth, has now been expanded to take in practically all of non-Communist Asia.

The Colombo plan has now become the center where a dozen national-development plans are synchronized. What's more, it allows Western nations to help Asians without arousing their suspicions. The Asians themselves are spending about \$2 billion this year on the Colombo plan, and loans and grants from the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have amounted to \$1 billion since 1950. Alongside this investment program there is a thriving program of technical assistance: Five thousand Asians are being trained, and 2,500 British and Commonwealth experts are building dams, making geological surveys, and applying the West's skills to the East's problems in a hundred fields.

This existing association of Asian nations could be expanded into a source of investment capital for the entire region with the backing of United States funds. A unilateral United States program might be called imperialism; a multilateral program under U. N. auspices might be sabotaged by Soviet participation. The Colombo plan avoids both dangers.

THE OBSTACLES

What's keeping us from doing what obviously needs to be done in Asia? It seems to me that there are three obstacles—apart from the administration's own indecision. One obstacle is our own fixed prejudices about foreign investment. Another, not so widely known but equally damaging, is Mr. Stassen's injection of party politics into the supposedly nonpartisan Foreign Operations Administration. The third obstacle has been and continues to be an absence of clear lines of authority in administering the program.

The illusion persists in the present as well as in the previous administration that private investors can meet most of the need for capital in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world. It is an attractive idea, but the simple truth is that right here at home, to say nothing of prospering Canada, the investor finds more lucrative and far safer investment opportunities than are to be found in any underdeveloped area. Foreign countries are now paying us half again as much return on past investments as American citizens are currently investing abroad. I am afraid that continued efforts by the Government to entice American investors abroad will have little effect. Private investors will go into the less developed areas only after some advance has been made on the basic problems of transportation, communication, and health. This can only be done by some form of public investment.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development does part of this job—the part that a strictly banking operation can appropriately do. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote United States trade rather than investment in other countries; so it too can meet only a limited need on a limited scale.

The proposed International Finance Corporation would be an excellent further step in the right direction. By investing in enterprises that Asians themselves start and manage and then selling off its holdings locally when the enterprises become profitable, such a corporation could promote industrial development and help to create a capital market at the same time. It would, however, leave still unsolved the problem of where the money for basic economic development is to come from.

For too many years, our Government has suffered from a lack of imagination in grappling with the whole problem of public investment in less developed areas. Only two forms of assistance have generally been thought feasible: direct grants, which are onerous to the recipients as well as to United

States taxpayers, and dollar loans that have to be repaid directly in dollars.

And yet there are other forms of dollar assistance that could be used. We need to learn to use them in Asia.

Suppose we should adopt a program to help finance a regional-development bank under the Colombo plan. The United States could provide the bank with a major share of its initial capital, and loans to the participating countries could then be paid back to the regional bank in local currency. This money could then be loaned out again for further development projects. Such a scheme would have several advantages:

It would create a long-term revolving fund to meet the need for continuous investment in such fields as public health, education, agriculture, and communications.

It would avoid the difficulty of repayment in dollars.

It would avoid the onus of "charity" for the recipient and some of the equally onerous "giveaway" implications for United States taxpayers.

It would clearly indicate a permanent interest on our part in helping Asians to realize their economic aspirations.

THE PORK BARREL

The second obstacle to moving ahead on an Asian program has been the way Mr. Stassen, the man who has advocated a new and bigger program, has been running the one he already had. To put it bluntly, political and patronage considerations have had a devastating effect on the operations of FOA.

Last year, I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act specifically prohibiting the application of "political tests" to FOA appointments abroad, including technical-assistance positions. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), sponsored the amendment in the Senate, and the provision is now law. Despite this legal restriction, FOA filled more jobs by the patronage method in the last half of 1954 than did the entire Departments of Defense, State, Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare combined. As a matter of fact, nearly 29 percent of all those given Federal employment under the "jobs-for-Republicans" program found a haven in Mr. Stassen's supposedly "nonpartisan" and relatively small agency.

In a 6-month period FOA found 237 job openings to refer to the Republican National Committee. Furthermore, funds appropriated for economic development and technical assistance have been diverted to pay for "observation trips" of Republican clubwomen. "Operation Reindeer" sent four prominent Republican women and their husbands to Europe during the Christmas season of 1953—at a cost of \$19,000—to observe the Christmas package program.

"Operation Crewcut" brought 16 young men into FOA last October to study local investment opportunities around the world. All 16 appointees were cleared with the party leadership. At this writing only three of the young men have been assigned. Thirteen remain on the payroll in Washington. The reason is simple: Small FOA missions abroad fight against the assignment of relatively unnecessary personnel whose salaries will cut into their meager staff allowances. The total cost of this program to date has been close to \$60,000, and the only benefit from it seems to have accrued to the Republican National Committee.

Since political affiliation has become an important criterion for recruitment and promotion, many competent technical and administrative people have left the agency, and those who remain find politics constantly interfering with their work. Efforts to find a worthy Republican for a particular job frequently hold up important projects. It has never been easy to find qualified specialists who are willing to go abroad; the intrusion

of partisan considerations makes it even more difficult.

Ever since the appointment in 1948 of Paul Hoffman, a prominent Republican, to head FOA's predecessor agency, the Economic Cooperation Administration, there has been a sort of gentlemen's agreement between Republicans and Democrats in Congress that overseas economic and technical-assistance activities are to be conducted on a nonpartisan basis. Mr. Hoffman's successor was another Republican, William C. Foster. This was good politics: The whole program depends upon bipartisan support in the Congress. Mr. Stassen's deviation from the nonpartisan approach has dangerously undermined congressional support.

UNDER ONE ROOF

The third obstacle to an effective program has been disagreement over how the program should be administered. There are those who believe that foreign economic programs should be administered by the State Department and other established Government agencies. Many, though by no means all, of those who want to partition all foreign economic operations into the old-line agencies hope that if the program is split up it can soon be killed altogether.

In my opinion, there are a number of reasons why it is desirable to keep the operating parts of an economic program separate from the regular duties of the State Department and the Foreign Service. The diplomatic responsibilities of Foreign Service officers require that they avoid any action that may be considered interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They cannot be expected to perform their primary duties effectively while operating a program, even one requested by the participating country, that by its very nature is involved in changing the internal affairs of that country.

But some kind of central direction is required. Although it is essential to use all the facilities and knowledge of other Government agencies, the program cannot be "farmed out" section by section to the various old-line agencies—Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and so on. Unified administration is essential. The best plan would seem to be a separate agency under an administrator who is responsible to the Secretary of State.

PROPOSALS

To this end, I propose that the Congress enact the following legislation:

Establish a permanent Technical Cooperation and Economic Development Agency under an administrator responsible only to the Secretary of State. Under this plan, economic and technical-assistance programs would be separated from military-aid activities, which would be transferred to the direct control of the Defense Establishment.

Authorize the continuation of the technical-assistance and development programs for periods of at least 4 years. Some degree of long-range planning is absolutely essential for any degree of success.

Authorize a regional fund for Asia, loans to be repaid in local currency. The funds should be used to further economic development through an agency like the Colombo plan.

Congress should furthermore make sure that all the facts about the administration of FOA are brought to light before new funds are appropriated. If it meant what it said last year about keeping politics out of economic and technical assistance, it should impress its attitude upon the new chief of whatever agency is set up to handle these matters.

Such a program will certainly not solve all our problems. It is only the beginning of a long process. But since so many of the obstacles we face are of our own making, an effective program in Asia must necessarily begin right here in Washington.